



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines


Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





42

LIB. ASSN.

300



McDONNELL
LIB. ASSN.

300

SOCIAL ACTION SERIES I.

THE CHURCH AND LABOR





THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK • BOSTON • CHICAGO • DALLAS
ATLANTA • SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON • BOMBAY • CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

THE CHURCH AND LABOR

PREPARED AND EDITED FOR
THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL ACTION OF THE
NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE COUNCIL

BY

JOHN A. RYAN, D.D., LL.D.

Professor of Moral Theology at the Catholic University of America
Author of "A Living Wage," "Distributive Justice,"
"Social Reconstruction," etc., etc.

AND

JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S.J., Ph.D.

Associate Editor of "America," Lecturer on Industrial History
at Fordham University
Author of "The World Problem," "Democratic Industry," etc., etc.

New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1920

All rights reserved

HD 6338

R 8

Nihil Obstat.

ARTHURUS J. SCANLAN, S.T.D.,

Censor Librorum.

Imprimatur.

PATRITIUS J. HAYES, D.D.,

Archiepiscopus Neo-Eboraci.

COPYRIGHT, 1920,

BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Set up and electrotyped. Published, October, 1920

INTRODUCTION

BY REV. JOHN A. RYAN, D.D.

THIS volume is the first of a series which will endeavor to present adequately and authoritatively the Catholic doctrine on industrial, social and political institutions and relations. The attitude of the Church toward the individual and the salvation of the individual soul is fairly well understood, not only by Catholics but by intelligent non-Catholics. What is not so generally realized is the fact that the Church has a comprehensive and definite attitude toward group life, and all the great forms and manifestations of group organization. At no time in her history has the Church overlooked or ignored the fundamental moral fact that individuals live and act in society, as members of social groups, and involved in a great variety of social relations; therefore, that the individual's conduct is in a large measure social. As a member of the existing industrial organization, the individual enters into one set of relations and performs one set of actions; as a member of civil society, he enters another set of relations and performs another set of actions; as a member of society in general, the great society, or the unspecified society, he has other relations and follows another line of conduct.

Precisely because the supreme object of the Church is to teach and help the individual to save his soul, she interests herself in social relations and the various forms of social organization. She maintains that the individual saves his soul not by faith alone but by works as well, by conduct, by obedience to the moral law. And she teaches that the moral law applies to every one of man's actions, those which bring him into relation with his neighbor, as well as those which affect only himself; those which arise out of his place in industry and in the State, as well as those which he performs as son, husband, or father.

Therefore the Church has a formal and definite teaching concerning the great social organizations which affect and determine individual conduct. She has a definite teaching concerning the relations into which men enter as members of these societies.

In the present volume her attitude and teaching are set forth in relation to one form of society, the industrial. The presentation does not, however, take in all the religious and moral aspects of industrial society. The book is entitled, "The Church and Labor," not, "The Church and Industry," nor "The Church and Capital," nor, "The Church and Agricultural Society." On each of these subjects a volume might be published, and in each case it would have a different scope from that of the one now offered to the public. Nevertheless, the labor problem is so intimately connected with the other problems and aspects of industrial society that the latter receive herein considerable attention and discussion.

The book is essentially a collection of documents, issued by Popes, cardinals, bishops, and lesser authorities, but it is more than a simple collection. It presents, indeed, all the authoritative Catholic doctrine on the subject that it covers, but it also enables the reader to trace the continuity of the doctrine and its essential unity. To the student of industrial thought this is almost as important as the advantage of having all the important productions assembled between the covers of a single volume.

One of the first reflections likely to occur to the discriminating reader is that the earliest production contained in the volume was written considerably less than a century ago. Nevertheless it would be wrong to draw therefrom the inference that Frederic Ozanam was the first prominent Catholic to discuss the labor question. In the thirteenth century,—to go no further back—St. Thomas Aquinas dealt with the ethics of wages; the great writers on justice in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, for example, Lugo and Lessius, treated the same subject with considerable particularity. The series of documents begins with the works of Ozanam and Ketteler because these were the first important Catholic authors who dealt with the

labor question in its modern form. When we think of labor, the condition of labor, or the laboring class today, we have in mind the present industrial system. We are concerned with the arrangement in which commodities are produced by wage earners under the direction and in the pay of another industrial class called variously employers, capitalists, entrepreneurs. It is the system known as capitalism. Inasmuch as this system originated less than a century and a half ago, it is not surprising that the first important discussions of its moral and religious aspects appeared only in the first half of the nineteenth century.

A still more significant fact, but one which probably will not occur to the majority of readers, is that the doctrines of Ozanam and Ketteler on social and industrial questions were at once original and traditional. They were original in the sense that they had not been enunciated by any previous Catholic authority. Ozanam and Ketteler had before them no papal encyclical as a guide and inspiration. The moral judgments that they uttered on contemporary industrial practices and on current proposals of reform, many of the moral principles that they enunciated for the abolition of industrial evils, and most of the economic proposals of betterment that they defended, had never been expressed by a Pope, nor indeed by any important Catholic.

On the other hand, their teaching contains no innovation and is in complete harmony with the traditional doctrines of the Fathers and the theologians. From their own explicit assurances we should know this to be the case, even if we were unacquainted with the ancient doctrines. Bishop Ketteler insisted again and again that he was teaching nothing essentially new, that he was proposing no principle that he had not derived from the patristic and mediæval authorities. A comparison of his account and conception of the traditional principles with the discussion of the same principles in Cardinal Bourne's pastoral, will show that the two historical interpretations are in complete agreement. A striking confirmation of the dependence of Ozanam upon tradition is seen in the circumstance that his utterances on social and labor questions oc-

cur not in a formal treatise in this field, but in lectures and discussions on historical subjects. In the history of the Church and her social teachings, he found the basis for those views to which he gave expression on the social question.

The explanation of this apparent contradiction, the reconciliation of originality with traditionalism in the social doctrines of Ozanam and Ketteler, is very simple. In Catholic tradition they found, indeed, no specific discussion of the capitalist system or its constituent elements, but they did find therein the general moral principles pertinent to all forms of industrial organization. Their task was to apply these to the new industrial order. The principles were old and traditional because they were derived from the Decalogue and the natural law. The application was new and original because the system of industry and industrial relations had been in existence for only half a century.

Still another striking fact about Ozanam and Ketteler is that their social teachings, not only in the general outlines but in most of the specific details, are in complete agreement with the pronouncements, even the most recent, of the Popes, cardinals and bishops who came after them. Their writings are the connecting link between the social principles of Catholic tradition and the authoritative and explicit Catholic social teaching of the present day. Ozanam and Ketteler are competent and convincing witnesses to the continuity of Catholic social principles. They bear witness that Pope Leo, Pope Pius and Pope Benedict, and the bishops of France, Ireland, Germany and the United States invented no arbitrary or makeshift doctrines to fit the new social conditions. No such expedient was necessary. An ample supply of sound and efficacious principles was found in the ancient treasury of the Church.

The agreement between the doctrines and the reforms advocated by Ozanam and Ketteler and those set forth in the encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII, is truly remarkable, especially as regards specific measures of industrial betterment. Ozanam emphasized the importance of the social question, declared that it could not be solved by mere palliatives, saw clearly the

evils of Socialism, demanded a living wage for all workers and something more where the labor involved unusual risk, hardship, or other special circumstances, and favored both State intervention and labor unions as means of improving the condition of the working classes. Bishop Ketteler expounded and defended all these views at greater length, rejected supply and demand as a determinant of justice; demanded security of a permanent livelihood for the worker; favored laws providing a shorter work day, Sunday rest and the abolition of child labor in factories under fourteen years of age; was opposed to woman labor in factories; and advocated cooperative associations of workingmen for the ownership and operation of productive enterprises. These he regarded as the most important element in his program of reforms, and he insisted that they were the modern embodiment of the guild idea, and the natural application of the traditional Catholic social principles to modern industrial conditions.

When we read Ketteler's discussion of cooperative production, written more than half a century ago, and then reflect that not a few prominent persons of today, including some Catholics, denounce the whole idea of cooperative production as "Socialistic," and even as "Bolshevistic,"—we are forcibly reminded that the great Bishop of Mayence was truly a pioneer, and that he anticipated many of the proposals and projects of industrial betterment that are still contested and still unrealized. Indeed, his program of social and political reform is still regarded as "advanced" by a considerable portion of society. And yet it was all based upon traditional Catholic principles and institutions.

So much space has been devoted to Ozanam and Ketteler, both in this introduction and in the main text of the volume, chiefly because they are concrete witnesses to the continuity and the unity of Catholic social doctrine. From the viewpoint of official authority, it would have sufficed to begin our compilation with the pronouncements of Pope Leo XIII, since he was sovereign teacher, and since we know that he would have taught nothing that was out of harmony with the doctrine of

his predecessors. Nevertheless, it is very helpful and satisfying to trace the actual connection and agreement between the ancient and the modern teaching.

More interesting to the average reader than the historical continuity of Catholic social teaching is its content. What has the Church to say today concerning our industrial system, and especially concerning the condition and aspirations of labor? The volume in hand is the answer to those questions. It contains practically every document of present importance issued by any Pope or bishop on these subjects since the Industrial Revolution.

By far the most important of the documents is Pope Leo's encyclical on the "Condition of Labor." While his two successors have supplemented his teaching in details, and have given it important specific applications to particular conditions and problems, they have added nothing essential. To this fact both of them have given explicit testimony. The various bishops and groups of bishops whose pronouncements are contained in the volume, have likewise acknowledged and maintained that they have followed the lead of this great encyclical, and have sought to interpret and apply it in the circumstances of their several conditions and countries.

The encyclical is not merely a code of moral principles applicable to industrial conditions and relations. It is at once a description of industrial evils, a condemnation of the spurious remedies proposed by Socialism, a statement of the leading moral and religious principles that underlie all sound economic life, and a proposal of concrete measures of social reform.

Three general propositions found in the encyclical constitute the main reason why it was written. First is the statement concerning the evils of the present industrial system. Very few summary indictments of these evils have been more severe than the words of Pope Leo: "a small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the teeming masses of the laboring poor a yoke that is little better than slavery." The second proposition sums up the Pope's condemnation of Socialism as a remedy for the evils: "it only injures those whom it would seem meant to benefit, is directly contrary to the natural rights of mankind,

and would introduce confusion and disorder into the commonwealth." The third general statement indicates the one indispensable remedial agency: "no practical solution of this question will be found apart from the intervention of religion and the Church."

Considered as a formal justification of the encyclical, this is the most important of the three declarations. It is likewise the justification of every other pronouncement on the industrial problem by Pope, bishop or priest. Precisely because the industrial relations and industrial systems involve moral problems and have moral aspects, the Church enters this field, and lays down formal and authoritative doctrine. If the relations between capital and labor, and between producer and consumer, and all the other conditions of industry were merely economic in their nature and implications, they would be outside the province of churchmen. Indeed, it was largely because the leaders of thought and of affairs, economists, politicians and business men, denied or ignored the moral aspects of industrial relations for more than half a century following the Industrial Revolution, that modern capitalism has produced so much misery, oppression and revolutionary discontent. In the words of Cardinal Bourne's Pastoral Letter, "all thought of the rights of each individual soul or of the community as a whole were obliterated, and men felt no qualms about the practical enslavement and degrading impoverishment of multitudes in order that a few might possess and command the resources of almost unrestricted wealth."

Pope Leo and every other churchman whose utterances appear in this volume, proceed from the principle that industrial actions and relations are quite as definitely within the field of responsible conduct and quite as definitely governed by the moral law as any other kind of human activity. Hence all these writers apply the principles and precepts of the moral law to the conditions of industry, pass moral judgments upon reform proposals, and even recommend practical measures of betterment. In following this course they maintain that they are fulfilling their proper and divinely ordained mission, which is to teach men not only what to believe but how to live. And

economic activities make up a very large part of life. Therefore, the official teachers of the Catholic Church repudiate utterly the theory of the autocratic and anarchical captain of industry, that the Church "has nothing to do with business." It has everything to do with business, insofar as business involves questions of right and wrong, of justice and injustice.

Turning now from the fundamental reasons of the intervention of the Church in the labor question, let us examine briefly the content of its teaching as exhibited in the documents composing this volume. In this exercise it will be convenient and sufficient to confine ourselves in the main to the encyclical "On the Condition of Labor." "The first and most fundamental principle," says Pope Leo, "must be the inviolability of private property." Again and again the importance of private property is stressed in the encyclical. It is likewise emphasized in the great majority of the other papers in the book. The utility and necessity of private property are set forth not merely as propositions having the sanction of economic experience, but as implications of the moral law. The institution of private ownership is declared to be so vitally bound up with right human life that to abolish it would be a violation of human rights. To destroy this institution would be to impair fundamentally men's capacity for right living. Therefore it would be an act of gross immorality. Hence the clear and uncompromising condemnation of Socialism.

On the other hand, the right of private ownership is not defended in these documents as an unlimited monstrosity. It is sharply restricted by the rights of the neighbor and the community. The stewardship of wealth is asserted, not as a high sounding phrase, but as a clear cut principle. The primary right of property is not that of private ownership at all, but that of use. And this right is natural, inherent, congenital in every human being that is born into this world. Whenever the individual right of ownership comes into conflict with this common right of use, the former, not the latter, must take second place. In this connection we recall the statement of St. Thomas Aquinas, that goods should be privately owned, but subject always to community of use.

Doubtless the duties of ownership with respect to the claims of common use differ in different circumstances. Sometimes they merely require the owner to distribute his surplus in charity. In other circumstances the stewardship of wealth means that the owners of capital are obliged to put it at the disposal of the community on reasonable terms, and that they should not exact extortionate interest or profits for this service. For many centuries the Church prohibited interest on loans, and fostered the doctrine that labor and risk were the only lawful titles of gain. It is quite probable that Pope Leo had in mind the excessive gains of monopolists, stock inflationists, and profiteers generally, when he condemned in the encyclical that we are now considering "rapacious usury which, although more than once condemned by the Church, is nevertheless under a different guise but with the like injustice, still practiced by covetous and grasping men."

The reader will turn the pages of the present volume in vain to find any justification for the perverted modern notion of property, that a man may do what he likes with his own.

In another very important respect the teaching on property by the authorities represented in this volume differs from that which is now held by many of our captains of industry. The latter think of private ownership as existing mainly for the few, as an institution that can function properly, even though it is not shared in by the great majority. This is not the view of Pope Leo, nor of the other Catholic authorities. According to the former, the State ought to make the owners of property as numerous as possible. In more than one place in the encyclical that we are considering, he points out the utility of private property for all, including the humbler classes. When cooperative ownership of the tools of production is recommended by Bishop Ketteler, by the four American Bishops in their "Program of Social Reconstruction," and by Father Husslein in his "Catholic Social Platform," we see merely the traditional Catholic conception of ownership stated and applied in modern terms to modern conditions. Neither in the writings of Pope Leo nor in the utterances of any other Catholic authority will be found a single sentence to support the detestable notion that

the institution of private ownership should be entrusted exclusively to the guardianship of a few super men.

Another fundamental doctrine in these documents declares the right of the wage earner to decent conditions of life and labor. He is to be treated always as a person, never as a mere instrument of production. Because he is a person he has certain rights, natural rights, God-given rights, which may not be ignored by those who control either industry or the State. Among them is the right to such conditions and terms of employment as will provide and safeguard a reasonable and humane kind of life. Hence we see Pope Leo demanding that the laborer's spiritual welfare be protected, that he be permitted rest from toil on Sundays and holydays, that he have "leisure and rest in proportion to the wear and tear of his strength," and that the length of the working day be proportioned to the nature of the work and the capacity of the worker. Women should not be employed in occupations that are unsuited to their sex, and children should not be placed "in workshops and factories until their bodies and minds are sufficiently developed."

In the matter of wages the doctrine of these documents is particularly humane, distinctive and definite. "There is," says Pope Leo, "a dictate of nature more ancient and more imperious than any bargain between man and man, namely, that remuneration ought to be sufficient to maintain the wage earner in reasonable and frugal comfort. If through necessity or fear of a worse evil the workman accepts harder conditions because an employer or contractor will offer him no better, he is made the victim of force and injustice."

This is the famous principle of the living wage, which is now almost universally accepted. When Pope Leo enunciated it more than twenty-nine years ago, it was looked upon by men of affairs as impertinent and utopian.

On the other hand, the moral duty of the laborer to give a fair day's work in return for a fair day's pay, is strongly insisted upon in most of the documents, as also is the obligation to refrain from violence during industrial disputes, and to respect the rights of property in all circumstances.

Another fundamental principle which is enunciated and applied again and again in these documents defines the industrial functions of the State. It is thus formulated by Pope Leo: "Whenever the general interest or any particular class suffers or is threatened with mischief which can in no other way be met or prevented, the public authority must step in and deal with it." This is a far cry from the doctrine of non-intervention, and from the shallow theory which opposes "class legislation." This principle justifies and authorizes the legal minimum wage, social insurance, public housing of the working classes, prevention and control of monopolies, and all the other reforms defended in the American Bishops' "Social Reconstruction Program" and in Father Husslein's "Catholic Social Platform." It is a complete refutation of the calumny that the Catholic Church has no faith in State intervention.

The right of labor to organize could hardly be more explicitly affirmed than it is in the encyclicals of Pope Leo and in many of the other documents. Pope Leo declares that "workmen's associations should be so organized and governed as to furnish the best and most suitable means for attaining what is aimed at, that is to say, for helping each individual member to better his condition to the utmost in body, mind and property." The Pastoral Letter of the American Hierarchy affirms "the right of the workers to form and maintain the kind of organization that is necessary and that will be most effectual in securing their welfare."

The moral aspect of industrial relations, the necessity and limitations of private property, the indestructible right of labor to the means and conditions of decent living, the duty of the State to remove industrial evils that can be abolished in no other way, and the right of labor to organize,—may be regarded as the main propositions expounded and defended in these papers and documents. Naturally they are not set forth with equal emphasis in all; for special circumstances of authorship, country and occasion have caused special stress to be laid here on one doctrine, there on another. Moreover, the teaching of the documents is in full harmony with the traditional principles of Catholic doctrine from the beginning. It is not too

much to say that the spirit and trend of the documents is also in accord with the aspirations of all those persons of our time who long for a saner and juster industrial order. If these men, to quote Cardinal Bourne, "take their stand upon the dignity of man, whether rich or poor, we can show them how every human being, created by God and redeemed by Christ, has a much greater dignity than they had dreamt of. If they claim for every human being a right to a share in the fruits of the earth, a right to live a life worthy of man, we endorse that claim with divine sanction. If they protest against industrial insecurity and the concentration of capital in a few hands, we point out how they are suffering from the blow aimed at the Catholic Church in the 16th century. If they have had a hard fight to establish the right of association in Trades Unions, it was because the Catholic voice had been silenced in the land."

There is one very important proposal of reform which appears in the writings of Bishop Ketteler, in the "Program of Social Reconstruction" of the four American Bishops, and in the papers by the Editors, which receives little or no specific mention in any of the other documents. It is the individual ownership, at least partial, of the means of production by the workers. In practice this project could be realized either by the workers' participation in ownership of the stock of corporations, although holding only a minority of the shares, or by complete cooperative ownership and management of industrial concerns. However, the reader who will study carefully the statements in the encyclical, "On the Condition of Labor," concerning the benefits of widely diffused private ownership, cannot escape the conclusion that Pope Leo would have regarded copartnership and cooperation as the best practical application and realization of this policy. Considered as a fundamental and consistent industrial system, cooperative ownership has a greater claim to the title of Catholic than any other. For the system that developed and that seemed destined to prevail in the days when Catholic principles and the social influences of the Church were at their zenith, in the later Middle Ages, was that in which the masses of the workers both in town and country

owned and managed the tools and the land. It is no longer possible for the majority of urban workers to become independent owners of separate industrial establishments. But they can exercise individual ownership and management through cooperation. It is such a system, and not either Socialism or present-day capitalism, that is in harmony with Catholic traditions and Catholic social principles.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION BY REV. JOHN A. RYAN, D.D.	v

I. THE TWO GREAT PRECURSORS OF MODERN CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY

By Rev. Joseph Husslein, S.J., Ph.D.

1. THE APOSTOLATE OF SOCIAL ACTION	1
2. FREDERIC OZANAM ON THE LABOR QUESTION	9
a. Liberalism and Socialism	9
b. Labor and Wages	14
c. Employers and Employed	18
3. WILLIAM EMMANUEL VON KETTELER	24
a. The Friend of the People	24
b. The Question of Property Rights	27
c. Cooperative Production	34
d. Ketteler's Labor Program	39

II. THREE SOVEREIGN PONTIFFS

1. ENCYCLICAL OF POPE LEO XIII ON THE CONDITION OF LABOR . .	57
2. ENCYCLICAL OF POPE LEO XIII ON CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY . .	95
3. APOSTOLIC LETTER OF POPE PIUS X TO THE BISHOPS OF ITALY ON CATHOLIC SOCIAL ACTION	110
4. EXTRACTS FROM THE LETTER OF POPE PIUS X CONDEMNING <i>Le Sillon</i>	118
5. ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF POPE PIUS X TO THE BISHOPS OF GERMANY ON TRADE UNIONS	122
6. LETTER OF POPE BENEDICT XV TO THE HIERARCHY OF FRANCE	133
7. LETTER OF POPE BENEDICT XV TO M. EUGENE DUTHOIT . .	135
8. LETTER OF POPE BENEDICT XV TO THE BISHOP OF BERGAMO .	138

CONTENTS

III. FOUR CARDINALS

	PAGE
1. MEMORIAL PRESENTED TO THE HOLY SEE ON THE KNIGHTS OF LABOR	145
By His Eminence, James Cardinal Gibbons	
2. REVIEW OF POPE LEO'S ENCYCLICAL ON THE CONDITION OF LABOR	159
By His Eminence, Henry Edward Cardinal Manning	
3. PASTORAL LETTER ON THE LABORER'S RIGHTS	177
By His Eminence, William Cardinal O'Connell	
4. PASTORAL LETTER ON CATHOLICS AND SOCIAL REFORM	187
By His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Bourne	

IV. THE BISHOPS OF FOUR COUNTRIES

1. PASTORAL LETTER OF THE BISHOPS OF IRELAND ON THE LABOR QUESTION	207
2. THE SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION PROGRAM ISSUED BY THE FOUR AMERICAN BISHOPS CONSTITUTING THE ADMINISTRATIVE COM- MITTEE OF THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC WAR COUNCIL	220
3. EXTRACT FROM THE PASTORAL LETTER OF THE BISHOPS OF FRANCE ON CONDITIONS AFTER THE WAR	240
4. DECLARATION OF THE AMERICAN HIERARCHY ON INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS IN THEIR PASTORAL LETTER	242
5. PASTORAL LETTER OF THE GERMAN BISHOPS ON SOCIALISM	249

V. PAPERS BY THE EDITORS

1. A LIVING WAGE	259
By Rev. John A. Ryan, D.D., LL.D.	
2. THE RECONCILIATION OF CAPITAL AND LABOR	272
By Rev. John A. Ryan, D.D., LL.D.	
3. A CATHOLIC SOCIAL PLATFORM	291
By Rev. Joseph Husslein, S.J., Ph.D.	

**I. THE TWO GREAT PRECURSORS OF MODERN
CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY**

BY REV. JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S.J., PH.D.

CHURCH AND LABOR

1. THE APOSTOLATE OF SOCIAL ACTION

THE ideal of Christian Democracy is old as the Church. It existed in the days of the Apostles, and flowered into mighty institutions over all the earth, in the gildhood of the Middle Ages. Its two great precursors, in our modern Catholic social movement, were Frederic Ozanam and Bishop von Ketteler.

Layman and ecclesiastic, these two men represent the combined leadership required within the Church to-day, when all the forces of Christianity must be mobilized for effective action. Social work was for them more than the practical solution of a mere material problem. It was a sacred and religious obligation. Lifted far above the realm of pure philanthropy and economics, their lives were dedicated and consecrated to the task of restoring justice and charity to the earth. More even than all this, they looked upon the work they had undertaken as the first and indispensable condition for winning back to Christianity the modern civilized world. Yet this did not lessen, but only heightened their interest in the concrete problems of poverty, wages and labor.

They were prophets in Israel, clear-visioned, far-sighted men, who came with a message for their generation, a message equally imperative for us to-day. "Back to the masses!" was the cry with which Ozanam startled his age. "My lot is cast with the people!" was the exclamation with which the social mission of the nobly born and titled Ketteler began. They were but working out in their own lives the example of Christ, who though He came to bring salvation to all, rich and poor alike, yet cast His own lot with the laboring classes. His doctrine and example were the social leaven that quietly transformed society, and as surely can transform it again in our day. It was therefore with a thrill of eager enthusiasm that Ketteler threw him-

self into this work when at the First Catholic Congress of Germany in 1848, he made this bold declaration:

Allow me to suggest a task for the immediate future, the task of religion in regard to social conditions. The most difficult question, which no legislation, no form of government has been able to solve, is the social question. The difficulty, the vastness, the urgency of this question fill me with the greatest joy. It is not indeed the distress, the wretchedness of my brothers — with whose condition, God knows, I sympathize with all my heart — that affords me this joy, but the fact that it must now become evident which Church bears within it the power of Divine truth.

The masses of the people, both Ozanam and Ketteler insisted, will judge the Church by the external works accomplished by her members. They will test the truth of our Faith by the sincere fulfilment of our duties towards our fellowmen. This truth every great Catholic social worker has understood. Thus, for instance, it was grasped at once by the keen mind of Count Albert de Mun in his very first close contact with the *Cercle Montparnasse*, the Catholic workingmen's club of Paris, and under his inspiration it forthwith issued its memorable "Appeal to Men of Good Will," on December 23, 1871:

Shall we leave these children — for the people are a child, sublime or egotistic — shall we leave these workmen, flattered in their passion or their pride, to complete the ruin of France and the world? Or drawing invincible strength from the Heart of Jesus, the Workingman, and calling to mind the glories of France and her title to Eldest Daughter of the Church, shall we make a last effort to save the people and to assert the reign of God in regenerated workshops and factories.

That is the question. It is no time for talking. We must act. To subversive doctrines, to disastrous teaching, we must oppose the holy lessons of the Gospel; to materialism, the notion of sacrifice; to cosmopolitanism, the idea of patriotism.

We appeal to all hearts of good will. The sons of darkness are forming associations, we too must form them. They found revolutionary clubs, we must found Catholic clubs. It will cost a hundred thousand francs, five hundred thousand, a million. No matter! Did it not cost more to recapture Paris from the Commune?

Though in this last mentioned event Albert de Mun had been forced into the field that civic order might again be restored in France; though his heart had bled at the fearful sights he

witnessed: "the fratricidal slaughter, the wild outbursts of hatred against authority and religion, the massacre of priests and hostages, the profaned churches and crosses," as a writer in the *Irish Rosary* describes them, yet his soul was filled with nothing but pity: "*Society is dying of irreligion.* The rich are utterly selfish. The poor are filled with hate. Is it the fault of the poor?"

De Mun had gone at once to the core of the entire problem. There can be no hope for society except through a renewal of religion. But the religion that we, in our own persons, represent to the world must be active, alert and keen to see the economic as well as the moral evils of our day; for both have their root, so far indeed as men are at fault, in the great defection of the modern world from Christ and His Gospel. We must do more; we must bring the remedy. Charity alone is not sufficient. Social justice too must be restored by us with fearless impartiality.

Ozanam placed the greater stress upon charity as the means of restoring justice; Bishop Ketteler more directly sought for social justice, with charity as a supreme motive. Both equally insisted upon the necessity of these two great virtues which must be the foundation of every Christian social order. Both saw in the fidelity with which Catholics will fulfill the obligations which these virtues impose upon them one of the most convincing arguments for our Faith, an argument, moreover, which the world imperatively demands of us. It will be instructive to study how each conceived of this same idea and made of it a new apostolate, a lever wherewith to move the world.

We are concerned in this volume with the labor question alone. Our consideration of Ozanam must therefore be from this point of view exclusively. But the motive that urged him to take so keen an interest in the industrial question was the same that propelled him to undertake the great works of charity for which he is most generally known to-day.

Why Ozanam, who was above all things a student, a man of books, a historian living in the past, a lover of scholarly quiet and seclusion, should have founded a society whose activities were, to all appearances, almost completely outside the sphere of his own natural inclinations, may often have seemed perplexing

to us. Probably we vaguely satisfied ourselves by seeking the explanation in that delicate gentleness and supernatural charity which so sweetly blended in him to form the charm of his character. Undoubtedly the Christian refinement of his early home, and the examples of heroic self-sacrifice which he was privileged to witness there must have left indelible impressions upon him. But it was none of these causes which gave the determining direction to his labors in the cause of charity.

Ozanam was truly a many-sided genius. The most varied undertakings entered into the compass of his interests. Yet there was one purpose to which all were subordinated; one object in which his whole life was centered: the demonstration of the truth of Catholicity. Literature, history, philosophy, science, mathematics, law, economics and languages were all made contributory to this one end. It was his determination to convince the world of the splendor and divinity of Catholic truth which inspired the thought of gathering together into the Cathedral of Nôtre Dame the intellectual élite of Paris that they might be won by the impassioned and persuasive eloquence of the young Abbé Lacordaire. It was the same purpose which gave the first impulse that led to the foundation of the conferences of St. Vincent de Paul.

We are familiar with the historic incident which so largely determined the course of his life: the challenge thrown out to him by the Saint Simonians and materialists of the Paris University. "You have good reasons," said they to the young Catholic students, "to talk of the past. There was a time when Christianity worked wonders; but now it is dead. In fact, what are you doing, you who boast of your Catholicity? Where are your works that *prove* your faith, that can make us respect and accept it?"

Ozanam had hitherto been easily able, by the mere force of truth and logic, to refute all their arguments against the Church. Here, however, was an objection which called for a different answer. It was a personal argument. An *argumentum ad hominem*, as they say in the schools. It called for nothing less than visible, tangible facts, not from remote periods of history, not even from distant countries or provinces, but from the lives of the students themselves.

Ozanam might readily have pointed to the many great institutions of charity within the Catholic Church, then as now; to the lives and labors of countless zealous priests, religious and laymen. But such an answer would not satisfy him, however much it might silence his adversaries. They were right in looking to his own life for a proof of the faith that was in him; and he would give it to them. His friends were of one mind with him. Their own conduct must be made to square with the ideals of Christianity. Though ardent in the practice and defence of their religion, they felt that the reproach was fairly merited. But what were they to do?

"Ah, well then," was Ozanam's only remark, "set to work! Let our acts be in conformity with our faith. But what are we to do? What, indeed, are we to do to be true Catholics, if not the one thing which pleases God most? Let us help our neighbor, as did Jesus Christ, and place our faith under the protection of charity." It was, therefore, no less than a living argument of their faith which they were going to give to the world. The religion of Christ was not dead.

The scoffing words of the Saint Simonians, the Socialists of his day, had been for Ozanam a flash in the dark. They were one of those providential means which God uses to compass great ends. Balaam had again become His prophet. Out of the mouth of scoffers the Lord had taught wisdom to His children. The star which had been shown to Ozanam and his comrades they now followed faithfully. It led directly to the house of poverty, where they found, like the wise men of old, "the Child with Mary His Mother." The gold of their love, the frankincense of their prayer, the myrrh of sacrifice they offered to Christ in His poor. In their hearts they were truly performing an act of faith; but for the world their external action was nothing less than a proof of the Divine and ever-vital power of the Church.

Yet it is not, as we have said, with the peculiar work of charity, which was in great part the fine flowering of the mind and heart of Ozanam, that we are to deal in the pages here devoted to him, but rather with his detailed views upon the vital industrial question. These it has been possible to gather from a careful survey of his works. The latter, in fact, con-

tain some of the most pertinent reflections upon modern labor problems, and an outline of a Catholic social system upon which, in certain ways, we have made but slight advances even in our days. It shows how Catholic social principles are of necessity always the same, whether we find them in the Fathers of the early Church; in the medieval economics of Saint Antonio composed at Florence, six hundred years ago; or in the latest pastoral of the Catholic Bishops. They are rooted alike in the Gospel of Christ and in the laws of nature, that do not change. The progress we ourselves are called upon to make consists in the constantly new application of these principles to the new conditions. This requires on our part careful study, accurate information, and often the most delicate discrimination.

* But to pass now from Ozanam to his great contemporary, the illustrious prelate who has been justly honored with the title of "The Bishop of the Workingmen."

It is remarkable that the same argument which was brought against Ozanam by the enemies of religion was likewise put by Bishop Ketteler, some decades of years later, into the mouth of the infidel workingman of his day. His purpose was to arouse the Catholics of Germany to a realization of their social mission. Maintaining at the historic Fulda Conference of 1869, in the presence of almost all the Bishops of Northern and Southern Germany, that the Church is bound in charity to aid in the solution of the labor problem, he drove home his conclusion with the very objection urged by the Saint Simonians. If the Church, as represented by her leaders, he solemnly warned the chief pastors of Christ's Flock, should fail in her duty, then may she well expect to hear the unbelieving laborer say to her:

Of what use are your fine teachings to me? What is the good of your referring me by way of consolation to the next world, if in this world you let me and my wife perish with hunger? You are not seeking my welfare, you are looking for something else.

He went further, and in express words referred to the accomplishment of this duty as an argument for the Divinity of the Church; as a proof, not in words, but in works, that Christ is indeed her Founder:

By solving this problem, which is too difficult for mankind left to its own resources; by accomplishing this work of love, which is the most imperative work of our century; the church will prove to the world that she is really the institution of salvation founded by the Son of God; for, according to His own words, His disciples shall be known by their works of charity.

The taunt which spurred on Ozanam, and the same difficulty placed by Bishop Ketteler in the mouth of the infidel working-man, have been frequently enough repeated in a later day. We must answer them by deeds. The countless institutions of Catholic charity, the lives of the unnumbered men and women who have given up all to follow Christ, who have devoted their means, their energies, their whole earthly existence to the love of God and of their neighbor, are indeed a sufficient argument to show that Catholicity is not dead, that it is a Divine and living Faith. But the world is too apt to pass by all these evidences and to ask of the priest, the layman, and the Catholic woman in the world, for still another and a personal proof. That proof likewise we must be prepared to give. Our religion, no less than charity, demands it of us.

A host of Catholic social workers is arising on every side. Catholic social and industrial organizations are being established in Europe and America. There is work for all, whether we wish to labor in the field particularly chosen by Ozanam or in that wherein Bishop Ketteler stands supreme.

"Enkindle again the fire of charity," pleads Ozanam, "and justice will reign on the earth." "Interest yourself in the laborer," warns Ketteler, "or others will do it in your stead who are hostile to the Church and to Christianity." Both have the same object; both are animated by the same spirit; both are equally inflamed with zeal in the cause of the laborer and the poor. Both have only one supreme desire, to bring the world to Christ. They are the preachers of a new crusade, a social apostolate among the masses, and their strong cry "God wills it!" rings down through the years to us. Successive Pontiffs have given their approval. It is a campaign of charity, a campaign of justice, not for one class, but for all classes alike. It is above all a campaign of religion to renew all things in Christ.

"Can and should the Church help to solve the social ques-

tion?" asks Bishop Ketteler in the address to which we have referred, and he replies:

There is only one answer to this question. If the Church is powerless here, we must despair of ever arriving at a peaceful settlement of the social problem.

The Church can and should help; all her interests are at stake. True, it is not her duty to concern herself directly with capital and industrial activity, but it is her duty to save eternally the souls of men by teaching them the truths of faith, the practice of Christian virtue and true charity. Millions of souls cannot be influenced by her if she ignores the social question and contents herself with the traditional pastoral care of souls. The Church must help to solve the social question, because it is indissolubly bound up with her mission of teaching and guiding mankind.

That task the Church has taken up anew today. The movements begun in modern times by Ozanam and Ketteler will be carried on by thousands of zealous workers, men and women, lay and clerics. The purpose of the present volume is to afford them the authentic and authoritative direction which the Church herself has to give them. With this in their possession they need but the two great virtues of patience and perseverance in their work of brotherly love. The life of de Mun was thus beautifully summed up by a fellow countryman:

"De Mun understood how *to wait and to work*. He never doubted. He knew neither religious, nor social, nor political doubt. He always went forward, his eyes fixed upon the Holy City of his dreams."

The following sections will deal in detail with the industrial teachings, respectively, of Ozanam and Ketteler.

2. FREDERIC OZANAM ON THE LABOR QUESTION

a. LIBERALISM AND SOCIALISM

"THE question which agitates the world to-day," Ozanam had written long before the fateful events of the year 1848, "is not a question of persons, nor of politics, but a social question." Carefully and accurately he had read the signs of the time. When the great industrial system of our age was far from its present development and when many of the clearest minds in Europe were but little dreaming of the coming issues, he had already sounded the problem of the future. In a letter to Foisset occur the following memorable lines:

The questions which will occupy the minds of men are the questions of labor, of wages, of industry, of economics.¹

When the Revolution broke out Ozanam beheld the realization of what he had long foreseen: that it is impossible for any modern government to endure, no matter what may be its form, if it does not give to social questions a first place in its considerations. In a letter addressed to his brother, the Abbé Ozanam, dated March 6, 1848, and published for the first time by Duthoit, in *Livre du Centenaire*, he contrasted the revolutions of 1830 and 1848. The former, he held, was political; the latter, social. The one was of interest to the educated classes, but the other of intense moment for the common people. It was all a question of labor organization, of hours of work and of wages.

We must not imagine that we can escape these problems. If men think that they can satisfy the people by giving them primary assemblies, legislative councils, new magistrates, consuls or a president, they are sadly mistaken. Within a decade of years, and perhaps sooner, the old difficulties will return.

¹ Eugène Duthoit in *Ozanam, Livre du Centenaire*, p. 354.

On the other hand, he candidly confessed that these problems cannot be touched without involving the entire financial, commercial and industrial order:

If the State intervenes between employers and employed to determine the wages, that liberty by which commerce has hitherto been nourished will cease to exist, until it can reestablish itself under the new laws. God knows what times, what difficulties, what sufferings we shall have to pass through!²

History has since borne evidence to the truth of all these statements, and the world has again been facing the crisis here described. There can be no question of peace until we have solved the problem presented by our modern industrial system, and have provided for a more reasonable distribution of wealth. No coercive features can be of any avail. So, after the days of the bloody Revolution, Ozanam wrote:

The danger which you congratulate yourselves that you no longer see upon the public streets has hidden itself in the larders of the houses that skirt them. You have crushed the revolt; there remains an enemy with which you are not sufficiently acquainted, Misery.³

In his description of the two extreme and contradictory economic systems then proposed for the solution of the social question, Ozanam was no less happy and accurate than Bishop Ketteler. The first of these was that individualism, or Liberalism, as it was ordinarily called, which left the weak at the mercy of the strong in the bitter economic struggle. Non-interference, except to safeguard the individual labor contract, no matter how unnatural and irrational, was held to be the sole duty of the State in the industrial question. Labor organizations were strictly interdicted and hunted to the earth, as preventing the normal development of supply and demand which it was believed would of itself solve all problems.

The connection between the Reformation and the evils of modern industrialism is already clearly traced by Ozanam. Individual reason, he argues, became supreme under the new doctrine. The effect was indifference in matters of Faith, lead-

² *Ibid.*, pp. 349, 350.

³ *Mélanges*, I, p. 264.

ing to deism, pantheism and atheism. To these succeeded the utilitarian doctrines of the economists and the dreams of humanitarianism. Thus through many transformations rationalism finally sprang into being. The will of the individual was confounded with the Divine will, private rights knew no limits except private pleasure. With the disappearance of the idea of right that of duty likewise vanished. The way was clear for the system of individualism or Liberalism to which the origin of all our modern economic evils must be ascribed. Socialism itself is the child of Liberalism, sprung from the parent it hates, like Death from the brain of Sin. Where Liberalism has transgressed, Socialism reaps the havoc.

The equal unsoundness of the Socialistic system Ozanam recognized at first glance. In his description of it, in spite of the changes which years have wrought, we still find those very characteristics which to-day call for the condemnation not merely of Socialism, but of all the measures of *exaggerated* State control, destructive alike of the best interests of family and community. Ozanam writes:

Never has Christianity consented to that enforced Communism which seizes upon the human person at his birth, thrusts him into the national school and the national workshops, makes of him nothing more than a soldier, without any will of his own, in the industrial army, a wheel without intelligence in the machine of the State. Thus between the individualism of the last century and the Socialism of the present, Christianity alone has foreseen the only possible solution of the formidable question which we are now facing, and alone has arrived at the point to which the more intelligent minds return to-day, after their wide circuit, when they insist upon association, but voluntary association.⁴

Especially worthy of note is his summary of the characteristics of the two schools we have here considered:

The old [*i.e.* the individualistic] school of economics knew no greater social danger than insufficient production; no other welfare than to urge and multiply it by an unlimited competition; no other law of labor than personal interest: the interest of the most insatiable of masters. On the other side, the school of modern Socialism traced all evil to a vicious distribution, and believed it could save society

⁴ *Les Origines du Socialisme, Mélange, I, pp. 246, 247.*

by suppressing competition, by making of the organization of labor a prison which would feed its prisoners; by urging the people to exchange their liberty for the certainty of bread and the promise of pleasure. These two systems, of which one made the destiny of man to consist in production, the other in enjoyment, lead by two different ways into the same materialism.⁵

This indeed is an accurate analysis of the entire situation, and deserves the closest study. These two schools are with us still, though other elements must also be considered in our day, such as a really harmful underproduction and the danger of organized labor forgetting the supreme interest of the common good.

In his discussion on property the great French layman bases all his arguments upon Saint Thomas, and in defining its duties and circumscribing its rights he speaks in terms which anticipate in a striking way the statements of Pope Leo XIII, in his encyclical upon Labor.⁶

With keen insight he remarks that when "an error touches property it is not far from laying its hands upon the family," a fact we see so fully realized in the actual propaganda of Socialism. This latter theory, he shows, is nothing new; but under various semblances had been incorporated in ancient paganism and in the sects of the early Church. But the sectaries at least did not pretend that by suppressing property they would save the family. Between Manicheism and Socialism he sees more than an accidental similarity. Both were a menace to the cradle and the hearth. While Socialism, it is true, deals only with productive property, yet its principles, as we find them propounded by many of its leading exponents and often put in practice, strike directly at the Seventh and Tenth Commandments, while its attitude towards matrimony, as expressed in the official organs of the party and the literature circulated by it, is sufficiently familiar.

From the insistence, however, with which this error perpetually returns through the centuries, he argues that we would strive in vain to put it down by the anathemas of authority or the rigors of the law, that it is seated in the deepest and most

⁵ *Extraits de L'Ere Nouvelle, Mélanges, I, p. 280.*

⁶ *Mélanges, I, pp. 224-226.*

piteous wounds of human nature. Theology, philosophy and jurisprudence may refute it, as they have done in the past, but it will perpetually reassert itself. It is one of the great problems which Providence uses to Its own wonderful ends. But in the very persistence of this error he likewise sees the reason for confidence:

Since the doctrines subversive to the family and to property, which ever waited at the gate of Christian society ready to seize the favorable moment for falling upon it, have had circumstances so favorable to their designs as the ruin of the Roman Empire and the barbarian invasion, as the internal dissensions of France from the time of the Shepherds to the uprising of the Farmers, and as the wars of religion and the ruin of the social order in the north of Europe; since, furthermore, in spite of all this daring, bravery and strength, they have in every instance been wrecked upon the soundness of civilization, there is consequently no reason any longer for being frightened at them as at some new unwonted peril. We may count upon the conscience and the good sense of the people who have resisted these temptations throughout eighteen centuries. We may count upon the power of Christianity, which has never failed to reject with the same firmness Socialistic errors and egoistic passions, which contains all the truths preached by modern reformers and none of their illusions, which alone is able to realize the ideal of fraternity without sacrificing liberty, of seeking the greatest earthly good for man without robbing him of that sacred gift of resignation, the surest remedy of sorrow and the last word in a life which must end.⁷

The Church, he writes, as if in answer to the latest jibe against her, has preached the duty of brotherhood and the honor of poverty throughout the ages; but she has pleased neither the unprincipled rich, who trembled at the *vae divitibus*, "Woe to you that are rich," nor the evil-minded poor, who see in the doctrine of resignation only an artifice of the clergy, and who, therefore, accuse the Church of holding the Gospel captive, while they themselves give it their own materialistic sense, substituting "a community of pleasures for a community of sacrifice."

We have thus far considered mainly the general attitude of Ozanam towards the two great schools of economic thought which, in their basic principles, still exist to-day. In the fol-

⁷ *Mélanges*, I, p. 255.

lowing section we shall describe in detail his own economic system as applied to the crucial question of labor and wages.

b. LABOR AND WAGES

In the second volume of Ozanam's miscellaneous writings, the eighth of his complete works, can be found the notes of a course of commercial law delivered by him while a young professor at Lyons, eight years before the outbreak of the Revolution of 1848. A brief sketch of the topics treated by him in each discourse is given, while now and then a striking thought is presented in ampler outline. The twenty-fourth lecture deals with the labor question, *Des Ouvriers*. Its importance in the mind of Ozanam is evident from the fact that it is followed by a "Recapitulation" hardly less comprehensive, and in many details more searching than the original discourse. Although it was the custom of Ozanam always to give a carefully prepared review of his previous lecture, the present repetition has been particularly chosen by his editors for reproduction as the most favorable examples of his methods. We have, therefore, sufficient material to form an accurate estimate of Ozanam's economic theory of labor and wages.

It would be impossible, as well as impracticable, to offer here in full the minute and undeveloped plans of lectures and repetition. The object is to select from his notes and jottings the leading economic ideas which are more strictly the coinage of his own mind, and to present them with their proper interpretation.

It is not necessary to delay long upon the first section which treats of the general character of labor and its part in production. Labor is for him "the sustained act of man's will applying his faculties to the satisfaction of his wants." The decree of work is written for all ages and for all mankind on the first page of the world's history, but pagan pride has always rebelled against it. In the ancient world it became the lot of the lower castes, of the helot and the slave. Only with Christianity and by the example of the Divine Artisan in the workshop of Joseph, the carpenter, was labor rehabilitated and lifted up to its true dignity. Labor, we must, however, bear in mind,

is of many kinds. It is not necessary, as Ozanam well says, that our hands be black with soot; they may be stained with ink.

Great stress is, therefore, laid by him upon the fact that there are three classes of labor: physical, intellectual and moral, and that all three are truly productive, in as far as they satisfy the threefold need of man, which is moral and intellectual as well as physical. A solidarity must be established between these classes. Intellectual and moral needs are as real as any others, and they who devote their lives to satisfying them are neither idlers nor unproductive members of society. Their work endures beyond the passing action in the influences they exercise and the institutions which they found.

In pointing to labor, capital and nature as the three elements which must enter into every process of production he agrees with the most modern economists. The capital of the moral worker would evidently, according to the mind of Ozanam, consist of his education and his moral qualifications which have been accumulated with not less care than the wealth of the capitalist, and are now productive of moral good. Ozanam's wide divergence from the Liberal and Socialistic schools is at once apparent.

In the second part of his discussion, however, which deals with the question of wages, this divergence becomes still wider and more pronounced. Yet nowhere shall we find a deeper appreciation of the miseries of the toiling classes, of the injustice to which they are so frequently subjected, and of the indignity with which they have been treated by liberalism, than in the pages of Ozanam. Nowhere, likewise, is there shown a more sincere determination and a more fearless courage in championing their rights. "It is time," he wrote in *Les Origines du Socialisme*, "to prove that we can plead the cause of the proletariat, to pledge ourselves to the solace of the suffering classes, to seek the abolition of poverty, without becoming a participant of the doctrines which unchained the tempest of June and which still are spreading their dark clouds about us."⁸ That poverty can never be entirely abolished he well knew and clearly stated, but he no less strongly taught

⁸ *Mélanges*, I, p. 212.

the duty of abolishing to the utmost of our power all the causes that culpably lead to it.

Leaving aside Ozanam's technicalities, which at times are perplexing, if not confusing, we shall come immediately to the vital question of wages. The terms "living," "personal" or "family" wage belong to the present stage of the controversy. Instead we find in Ozanam the distinction made between what he equivalently calls the "natural" wage, *taux naturel du salaire*, and the "actual" wage, *taux réel du salaire*.

The wages, according to Ozanam, should pay the laborer for all that he places at the disposition of industry. They are three things. First, the "meritorious will," or as he likewise calls it, *volonté courageuse*. While this title now sounds fanciful, it evidently implies nothing more than the ready and faithful actual service which the wage-earner renders to his employer. For this the least that can be given him is a payment which will afford him the possibilities of existence. In the second place, he offers his education. This is equivalently his capital, and therefore gives him a title to interest, an interest which will enable him to pay for the education of his own children in their turn. Thirdly, he sacrifices his vital strength, which cannot endure when old age approaches. He has, therefore, a natural right to a wage which besides providing for his living expenses and the education of his children will likewise enable him to retire in old age. This is, as it were, the rent paid upon his life which was placed at the disposition of his employer. Were he not to receive this rental he would practically have sold his life, which, Ozanam argues, is a sacred possession of the laborer.

However much this method of argumentation, with its touch of poetry, may appeal to the reader, the conclusion is clear. The laborer is entitled, according to Ozanam, to a wage which will provide for his own proper living and for the education of his children, and which will permit him to retire from work in his declining years to live upon his savings. Thus he will not stand in need of an old age pension by which to support himself when his "vital force" has been exhausted in the service of industry. That the wages may suffice for all these

purposes, Ozanam, however, supposes thrift and virtuous living on the part of labor. The first of these conditions, to go no farther, Socialists spurn in order to keep the wage-earner in his indigence, even when wages are just and satisfactory. Only in this way can they hope to bring about the revolution under all circumstances.

Thus far, however, we have only considered what Ozanam calls the "absolute conditions" determining wages, but there are likewise "relative conditions" to be taken into account. Special wages are demanded according to the difficulties or hardships of the work: when it is painful, disagreeable or dangerous; when it is subject to interruptions, like the trade of the mason; when it requires extraordinary strength, dexterity, study, or long years of apprenticeship.

The fact, however, is that the actual wage is often beneath the natural wage. This leads Ozanam to a searching consideration of the relations between employer and employed and a discussion of the necessity and limitation of State interference. To these subjects we shall return in the following section.

The views of Ozanam upon the leading economic issues of our day have far more than a mere historic interest. They bring us face to face with the great Catholic social principles and demonstrate the continuity of Catholic teaching. Even where changes have openly been made, as in the question of interest, there has not been the least sacrifice of principle on the part of the Church. In the application itself of fundamental Catholic truths to new economic conditions, as in the instance given, the change is often more apparent than real. Much of the terminology in the lectures of Ozanam, delivered over three-quarters of a century ago, will appear strange to the modern reader, and calls for interpretation. But his doctrines themselves are not new to us; they perfectly agree in substance with the teaching of our Catholic economists.

If we sum up, therefore, what has thus far been said by him upon the wage problem, and express it in the language of our own day, we arrive at the conclusion that he demands more than a mere personal or living wage, that, as closely as we can approximate to his idea in this important question, he is a de-

fender of the family wage. It is true that he speaks only of a wage which must suffice for the education of the laborer's children, while no express mention is made of the support of the mother of the family. But the latter demand is naturally included in the former, especially since much of the education of the laborer's offspring, in the broad sense in which Ozanam employs the term "education," must depend upon her. His severe strictures, moreover, upon woman labor as well as child labor can leave no reasonable doubt upon this point. There was then, of course, no question of prolonging the common education to the fourteenth, much less to the sixteenth year.

C. EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYED

The reasons given by Ozanam why a just wage is often denied the laborer are reducible to two main classes: inability on the part of the employer and wilful exploitation of labor. As remedies for the former he suggests a more adequate knowledge of the laws of supply and demand, a more rigid economy in avoiding waste, and a more perfect distribution of money for rent, interest, tax and profit; in brief a better understanding of industrial and commercial questions. The second difficulty is not solved so easily, since it is the result of a perverted human will. It is due to the greed of capitalist and dividend-hunters, and must therefore be met by a definite action on the part of the State, of the community and of the labor unions.

In his definition of exploitation Ozanam is eminently clear and to the point. The employer becomes guilty of this crime "when he does not consider the worker as an associate and an auxiliary, but as a tool from which he is to derive as much service as possible at the least expense possible." This is Catholic doctrine in its integrity.

Such exploitation of man by man Ozanam calls by no other name than slavery. The human laborer, the masterpiece of the Creator, the image of God, the immortal heir of heavenly glory, has in such a system been reduced to a mere machine. His service has become servitude. He is "only a part of capitalism, like the slave of the ancient pagans." No more therefore is done for him that for the machine at which he stands. It is all

a question of the greatest economy. Child labor follows, and the mother likewise is torn from her home. The moral and intellectual needs of the toiling masses are of no consequence and the family is disintegrated without a qualm of conscience. Sanitary conditions are neglected and the workshop becomes a veritable prison house where man, woman and child are condemned to a systematic and progressive degradation. Such must of necessity be the conditions wherever the Liberalistic form of capitalism is allowed full freedom without the interference of State action and labor unionism. Such have been and still are the actual results in many instances. Need we wonder that the great Catholic social leaders all with one voice more bitterly condemn the vices of individualism or Liberalism than even the errors of Socialism. The first are the cause, the latter only the effect.

What then is to be done? Clearly the Government must interfere. The policy of absolute liberty, *Laissez faire, laissez passer*, can not be tolerated. The individual laborer, says Ozanam, is under a threefold disadvantage. He has less to spare than the capitalist, and therefore is urged by need to accept the terms which are offered him. He has a more limited horizon than his employer and is consequently more subject to alarm and intimidation. He is finally more restricted in his choice of occupation. The capitalist can find many ways of investing his wealth, the laborer is bound to his machine or at least to the trade which he has learned.

While such is the condition of the laborer, there is no less danger, on the other hand, to be apprehended from a paternalistic government. Experience has shown that it hampers industry and strangles commerce. No worse form of universal slavery could finally be imagined than the paternalism to which Socialist agitators would subject the entire human race.

The solution therefore of the problem must consist in a proper balancing of liberty and authority. Government intervention is necessary, but must be restricted to extraordinary circumstances. It is called for to just the extent that the common welfare requires it. So far and no further. Much can be accomplished by the education of the worker and by proper

labor organizations. The employer likewise needs to be taught that liberal wages encourage the workingman, make him take more pride and pleasure in his task and help him to identify his interest with his occupation.

The laborer will be attached to his work as to something that is his own, industry will advance in perfection, and that demoralization which we make at the same time a reproach and a necessity for the proletarian will cease with the prospect of his going forth one day from his state of helotism.⁹

It must be borne in mind that the conditions of which Ozanam wrote are not to be indiscriminately compared with those of our time. It is only the Socialistic writer, and men who have similarly become infected with a false radicalism, who will condemn the entire employing class as guilty of heartless exploitation. Ozanam, as we may judge from his many writings, had no thought of attacking the principle of wages in itself, but only the abuses to which it had given occasion and which had become common in the factory system of his day. Nothing could be more terrible than the moral, intellectual and physical degradation implied in the picture given of it by Kolping in Germany; while Manchester and other great industrial centres of England were veritable studies for a new Inferno. We are not, therefore, surprised at the bold and unqualified assertion which we find twice repeated in the notes of Ozanam that the great industrial captains of his day could only be compared to "those barbarian royalties who were borne about upon a shield on the shoulders of the people."¹⁰

It is difficult for us to conceive the horror with which the Catholic mind at this period contemplated the transition from the domestic to the factory system. The danger and degradation it implied for the laborer were not essential parts of the new system itself; but under the pagan individualism of the times, which the Reformation had brought about, the laborer was practically handed over as a slave into the hands of the factory owner. The economic philosophy of the day forbade the

⁹ *Mélanges*, II, p. 582.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 586.

State to interfere and suppressed the labor union, so that no redress could be had. The conscience of the employer, deadened by what he knew to be the custom of the time, was the only court of appeal which labor had. Such a condition could never have been brought about, except by the rejection of Catholic philosophy and Catholic faith. There is hope for labor only in as far as Catholic principles are adopted. That, however, in the stress of unlimited competition and amid the surroundings we have here described, the Catholic employer should often himself have yielded to the principles which were almost forced upon him, is sufficiently intelligible.

In his own day Ozanam beheld capital and labor facing each other as two hostile armies. On the one side he pictured the power of wealth; on the other, the force of numbers. The acts of physical violence and the strikes of the toiling multitudes recalled to his mind the historical scenes of the seceding Roman plebeians.

We have already briefly indicated Ozanam's economic solution. It would be wrong, however, to convey the impression that he believed the question to be mainly an economic one. He well understood that the evils of the time were all reducible to a want of charity and justice. The restoration of economic justice, where it is violated, depends largely upon the power of law and of organization. But justice can never be restored without charity, the absence of which is the radical reason for the existence of the social question itself. To pastor and people alike therefore Ozanam reads the great lesson of charity. They must go out into the world and take an active part in relieving misery wherever they find it. They must move the hearts of the rich and cheer the hearts of the poor. In both they must enkindle that fire of charity which Christ came to bring into the world. Charity then will return to earth leading Justice by the hand. But it must be a charity founded upon faith and religion.

We have spoken only of the faults to be found in certain classes of employers. Ozanam well knew that labor likewise is not always blameless. Want of fidelity and of application

to its employment, thriftlessness and dissipation, and even worse evils were often justly set to its account, but tenderly he dealt with them as a mother might, yet no less resolutely. Labor indeed had not then attained the position which it not unfrequently holds today, when the tables are turned at times and the employer may find himself helpless against a powerful trade union, defying the public itself, and demanding, it may be, its own arbitrary price. This would be the Liberalism of labor succeeding the Liberalism of capital, a danger against which every Catholic trade unionist must be upon his guard.

As a final rule Ozanam demands that a fair proportion be observed between the profits of the employer and the wages of the laborer. There is usury, he argues, as well in excessive profits, which do not correspond to any equivalent labor on the part of the employer, as in excessive interests which exceed the use-value of the money loaned. The danger of harming less fortunately circumstanced competitors must of course, within reasonable limits, be borne in mind. Allowance must likewise be made for the additional rent derived from the land and for the interest on the capital invested, which belong to the employer if he is both owner and manager. If, however, for these reasons and because of extraordinary intellectual labor and ability he accumulates a fortune exceeding the needs of his station in life he has no right to use it selfishly, but must consider the common good. As long as such fortunes are accumulated, and used as an absolute personal possession and not as a stewardship for God, the war between capital and labor will continue, no matter what economic transformations may take place.

Ozanam made no pretence to profound economic knowledge. When asked to assume political leadership he expressly pleaded that he was insufficiently versed in these questions. This was true only in so far as he was mainly a student of past events, with the one great purpose of bringing into evidence the glorious rôle of the Catholic Church in the world's history. But we must not forget that he was always closely in touch with the actual life of labor and poverty, and a shrewd observer of all he saw. Even while delivering his economic lectures his habit-

ual modesty asserted itself. "The humble words," he said, "which come from this chair are only an imperceptible scattering of seed. Yet who knows but it may ripen in the secret depths of your thoughts and unfold itself one day in effective plans."

3. WILLIAM EMMANUEL VON KETTELER

"THE BISHOP OF THE WORKINGMEN"

a. THE FRIEND OF THE PEOPLE

"We joyfully confess," wrote Bishop Ketteler in answer to the slur of a Freemasonic journal that his audience on a certain occasion was composed mainly of laboring men, "that every dock-hand, every day-laborer, every peasant is of as much moment to us as any prince or king, and that we place human dignity far above all class distinctions. We feel nothing but inexpressible pity for those who esteem the wealthy manufacturer higher than the poor farmhand."¹

That will suffice to introduce the "Bishop of the Workingmen." He spoke not for himself alone, but for all the Church which still continues to fulfil Christ's mission upon earth: "and the poor have the Gospel preached to them." Yet from the lowliest worker in the realm to the Iron Chancellor all, whether they wished it or not, were obliged to listen to the voice of Ketteler. "Consult the writings of the Bishop of Mainz," said Bismarck misinterpreting their sense in his Kulturkampf speech; "they are cleverly written, pleasant to read and in everyone's hands." No mean compliment from a bitter enemy.

In the realm of industrial relations, to which we are here confining ourselves, the name of Bishop William Emmanuel von Ketteler must ever stand recorded as that of the pioneer of modern Catholic action in the industrial field. "He was my great precursor in the labor cause," Pope Leo XIII justly said of him. In seeking to quote from his many writings on the greatest of modern questions we are hopelessly bewildered by the abundance of matter that still remains of enduring value in his works.

Of magnificent and commanding appearance, with clear-cut

¹ *Kann ein gläubiger Christ Freimaurer sein*, p. 95. Liesen, *Bischof Ketteler und die soziale Frage*, p. 25.

features and kindly yet penetrating glance, Bishop Ketteler exercised an irresistible power wherever he appeared. His voice could sway the largest audiences and his written word was eloquently persuasive. "You wield a good pen, my son," the aged Pope Pius IX said to him on his last visit to Rome, shortly before his death. His first great social utterance will never be forgotten in the annals of the Catholic social movement. It was delivered in the fateful year 1848, when as pastor of Hopsten and Representative of the Frankfurt Parliament he was called upon to speak at the grave of two deputies who had been brutally murdered by an enraged mob for their free public utterances. Seventy years later, in 1918, his ringing words might again have been spoken with equal truth under very similar circumstances.²

Who, I ask, are the murderers of our friends? Is it indeed they who have riddled their bodies with bullets? No, it is not they. It is the thoughts that bring forth good and wicked deeds on earth—and the thoughts that have brought forth these deeds are not the thoughts of our people. My lot is cast with the people; I know it in its pains and in its sorrows. I have devoted my whole life to the service of the people, and the more I have learned to know them, the more also I have learned to love them. No, I repeat again, it is not our noble, honest German people from whom this horrible deed has gone forth. The murderers are the men who sneer at Christ, at Christianity and the Church before the people; who try to pluck the blessed message of Redemption out of the hearts of the people; who raise rebellion, revolution, to the dignity of a principle; who tell the people that it is not their duty to govern their passions, to subject their actions to the higher law of virtue. The murderers are the men who set themselves up as the lying idols of the people, in order that these may fall down and adore them.

On all sides I hear the cry for universal peace—and whose soul would not joyfully join in the cry?—and I see men ever more and more divided against themselves, the father against the son, the brother against the sister, the friend against the friend; I hear the cry for equality among men, an equality which the message of salva-

² The translations of Bishop Ketteler's words throughout this section are taken from the excellent renditions contained in George Metlake's *Ketteler's Social Reform*, published by the Dolphin Press, Philadelphia. A somewhat similar work in German, though less ample, is the centenary volume, *Bischof v. Ketteler als Vorkämpfer der christlichen Sozialreform*, by J. Mundwiler, S. J.

tion has been teaching for thousands of years, and I see man striving frantically to raise himself above his fellow-man; I hear the beautiful, the sublime cry for brotherhood and love, a cry borne down to us from Heaven, and I see hatred and calumny and lying running riot among men; I hear the cry to hold out a helping hand to our poor suffering brother,—and who, if he has not plucked out both his eyes, can deny that his need is great, and who that has not torn his heart out of his bosom, will not join all his soul in this cry for help?—and I see avarice and covetousness increase, and pleasure-seeking grow more and more. I see men who call themselves ‘friends of the people’ adding to the general distress, undermining the love of work, and setting their poor deluded brother at the pockets of his fellow-man, keeping their own money-bags tight sealed the while; I hear the cry for liberty, and before me I see men murdered for having dared to utter an independent word; I hear the cry for humanity, and I see a brutality which fills me with horror.

O yes, I believe in the truth of all those sublime ideas that are stirring the world to its depths to-day; in my opinion not one is too high for mankind; I believe it is the duty of man to realize them all, and I love the age in which we live for its mighty wrestling, however far it is from attaining them. But there is only one means of realizing these sublime ideals—return to Him who brought them into the world, to the Son of God, Jesus Christ. Christ proclaimed those very doctrines which men, who have turned their backs on Him and deride Him, are now passing off as their own inventions; but He not only preached them—He practised them in His life, and showed us the only way to make them a part and parcel of our own lives. He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life; outside of Him is error, and lying, and death. Through Him mankind can do all things, even the highest, the most ideal; without Him it can do nothing. With Him, in the Truth which He taught, on the Way which He pointed out, we can make a paradise of earth, we can wipe away the tears from the eyes of our poor suffering brother, we can establish the reign of love, of harmony and fraternity, of true humanity; we can—I say it from the deepest conviction of my soul—we can establish community of goods and everlasting peace, and at the same time live under the freest political institutions; without Him we shall perish disgracefully, miserably, the laughing-stock of succeeding generations. This is the solemn truth that speaks to us out of these graves; the history of the world bears it out. May we take it to heart.³

The history of the years that were to follow has indeed abundantly borne out the truth of Bishop Ketteler’s word. His

³ *Predigten*, II, pp. 107 ff. Metlake, pp. 21 ff.

warning is as needful to the nations of the earth today as when it was fearlessly uttered in the presence of an audience thrilled and awed by his living eloquence.

b. THE QUESTION OF PROPERTY RIGHTS

In the speech just quoted we find a striking reference to the possibility of establishing under Christianity a true community of goods. This suggested Communism differs essentially from the Communism of Marx, and when carefully analyzed will be found to be nothing more than what Pope Leo XIII has described in a word more suitable for our own day, as "Christian Democracy."

Communism, in the year 1848, was a word to conjure by. In this same year, a few weeks before the French Revolution, Marx and Engels had flung upon the world their "Communist Manifesto," the future gospel of Socialism. These founders of the modern Socialist movement deliberately chose the word "Communist" as summing up the extreme radicalism of their day. Their doctrine itself was soon, however, to be known as Socialism the world over, though the present Communism, too, is its legitimate offspring. In opposition to the "false Communism" of the times Bishop Ketteler therefore proposed the "true Communism," or as we should say today, the "Christian Democracy" of the Catholic Church. The contrast between the two chief founders of these opposing social movements, the Socialist and the Catholic, Marx and Ketteler, presents indeed a picture of absorbing interest.

Both were working simultaneously, independently, and from different points of view, at the solution of the same problem. Both were born leaders of most remarkable gifts, of originality in thought, of boundless capacity for work, of fiery temperament, of utter fearlessness in the enunciation of their principles. Each was supreme in his field. "Marx stood higher, saw further, took a wider, clearer, quicker survey than all of us," said Engels, his co-laborer; "Marx was a genius, we others were, at best, men of talent." Ketteler, on the other hand, was no less unquestionably the greatest prelate in the social sphere. Marx, inspired with the hatred of the lost archangel,

casting off all religion and belief in God, fulminated his thunders against the entire state of existing society. Confusing abuses with inherent evils, he strove, under cover of materialistic evolution, to set class against class in a deadly conflict, lifting up the battle cry which was to arouse every latent passion of envy, greed and hatred in the hearts of his followers: "Expropriate the expropriators!" Ketteler, on the contrary, urged on by the Spirit of God, came to bring peace and blessing to the world. With all the power of his high office, his majestic presence and his stirring eloquence, he fearlessly set his face against the oppression of the poor, the injustice of the law, the godlessness of the schools, and the usurpation of the authority of the Church by the State. To these last two causes he rightly attributed in largest measure the abject poverty of the masses. He came to minister spiritually and temporally to the wants of the poor and to reorganize the working classes. That many of the conditions he describes no longer exist is due in no small degree to his initiative, and the future development both of industry and of organization, which he clearly foretold, has introduced mighty changes in the social problem.

According to Marxian philosophy, the root of all the world's evil, of vice as well as of poverty, is purely or overwhelmingly economic, and therefore a state of prosperity and universal virtue can be effected only by economic causes. This is the essential doctrine of the Marxian theory. If men remain such as they are the Socialistic commonwealth must clearly be impossible. The Socialists themselves confess it. Ketteler's mind saw further. He, too, recognized the economic causes and pointed them out; but beneath them all, in the soil untouched by Marx or Engels, he found the real root of all disorder, original sin. In strong words he asked:

How is it possible that on the one hand we see rich men, in the face of the most elementary laws of nature and without a qualm of conscience, wasting their substance riotously, while the poor are starving and the children degenerate? How is it possible for us to relish superfluities whilst our brothers are in want of the barest necessities of life? How is it possible that our hearts do not break in the midst of revelry and song when we think of the sick poor who

in the heat of the fever are stretching out their hands for refreshment and no one is by to give it to them?

Then, after describing the saddest of all sights, the little children growing up in vice and sin, he continues: "And on the other hand, how is it possible that the poor and their godless seducers, contrary to all natural right and all common sense, embrace the absurd theory of false Communism, and look to it for salvation, though it is so evident that it would drag all humanity down to its ruin?" The answer, he says, is to be found in the doctrine of original sin, without which man must remain a mystery to himself.⁴

It was the question of property rights, therefore, which first engaged Bishop Ketteler's attention in his famous sermons on "The Great Social Questions of the Day," which were delivered during the same memorable year, 1848. The first of these dealt with "The Christian Idea of the Right of Property." The second contained in detail an exposition of the principles enunciated 600 years before by the great Catholic doctor, St. Thomas. These principles of necessity remain the same today, for principles do not change. It is their application only that must ever be newly made to keep pace with the varying circumstances of time and peace.

All creatures, and therefore all goods of the earth, Ketteler argues, can of their very nature belong to God alone. He alone can have essential and complete ownership over them. Man's right is strictly limited to the use and enjoyment of them, the "usufruct," as throughout the sermons, it is technically called. In no other respect can any human being claim a right in their regard. Nor is this right to the use and enjoyment of the goods of earth unrestricted, since it may be exercised only "*as God wills and as He has ordained.*" Since God is the only absolute owner, it follows obviously that no one may do just as he pleases with the earthly goods in his possession. These truths Ketteler develops further in the following crucial passage:

To God therefore belongs, to conclude with St. Thomas's own words,

⁴ *Predigten*, II, pp. 136 ff.

the sovereign proprietorship over all things. But in His Providence He has destined some of these things for the sustenance of man, and for this reason man also has a natural right of ownership, *viz.* the right to use things. Two very important conclusions follow from these premises.

In the first place, the Catholic doctrine of private property has nothing in common with the conception current in the world according to which man looks on himself as the unrestricted master of his possessions. The Church can never concede to man the right of using at his pleasure the goods of this world, and when she speaks of private property and protects it, she never loses sight of the three essential and constituent elements of her idea of property, *viz.* that the true and complete right of property pertains to God alone, that man's right is restricted to the usufruct, and that man is bound, in regard to this usufruct, to recognize the order established by God.

Secondly, this doctrine of the right of property, having its root and foundation in God, is possible only where there is living faith in God. It is only since the men who call themselves the friends of the people, though steadily compassing the public ruin, and their spiritual progenitors, have shaken mankind's faith in God, that the godless doctrine could gain ground which makes man the god of his possession. Separated from God, men regarded themselves as the exclusive masters of their possessions and looked on them only as a means of satisfying their ever-increasing love of pleasure; separated from God, they set up sensual pleasures and the enjoyment of life as the end of their existence, and worldly goods as the means of attaining this end; and so of necessity a gulf was formed between the rich and the poor such as the Christian world had not known till then. While the rich man in his refined and pampered sensuality dissipates and wastes his substance, he suffers the poor man to languish for very lack of the barest necessities of life and robs him of what God intended for the nourishment of all. A mountain of injustice, like a heavy malediction, rests on property thus abused and diverted from its natural and supernatural purpose. Not the Catholic Church, but infidelity or atheism has brought about this state of things, and just as they have destroyed in the poor man the love of work, so are they destroying in the rich man the spirit of active charity.⁵

Man's right of ownership, then, is nothing more than "a right conceded him by God to use the goods of earth as the Creator has ordained." This right, Ketteler continues, men can exercise in either of two ways: "Men can either exercise their property, or rather usufructuary, rights in common, that

⁵ *Predigten*, II, pp. 120 ff. Metlake, pp. 32 ff.

is, administer the goods of earth in common and divide the profits (Communism); or they can possess them divided, so that each man has property rights over a specified portion of them and is at liberty to dispose of the profits derived from them."

Which of these two systems, Communism or private property, he asks, is destined for man? In answering this question he again follows St. Thomas and divides the sole right to property that man can possess into:

- I. The right of management and administration.
- II. The right of enjoying the profits.

Of the first of these rights he affirms with St. Thomas that in regard to the management and administration of property the individual right of ownership over the goods of the earth is to be upheld. His reasons are, in the first place, that "it is the only way to secure good management, for every one takes better care of what belongs to himself than of that which he possesses jointly with other." To this he adds the lack of improvement and incentive that would follow from a common ownership, and the laziness that must gain the upper hand from the loss of any counterpoise. The other reasons, briefly stated, are that the right to private property alone can guarantee the order required for fruitful management, and finally that it alone can preserve peace among men. "For we know from experience how easily joint possession of property leads to disputes and quarrels," even where the inmates of the same house "share with each other nothing but the air they breathe and the water they draw from the common well."

Coming then to the second of these rights, that of enjoying the profits, he lays down the rule which is the very foundation stone of Christian Democracy:

But in regard to the enjoyment of the fruits derived from the administration of earthly goods, St. Thomas lays down a very different principle. Man, according to him, should never look upon these fruits as his exclusive property, but as the common property of all, and should therefore be ready to share them with others in their need. Hence the Apostle says: "Charge the rich of this world to give easily, to communicate to others."* Thus, on the one hand,

* I Tim. xvii, 18.

we see Christianity opposing the false doctrines of Communism, and on the other no less strenuously combating the false doctrine concerning the right of ownership, and setting up true Communism.⁷

This true and voluntary Communism, carried to the height of a complete oblation of all earthly goods, which the Church would forcibly impose upon no man, Ketteler thus described in his well-known sermon for the Feast of Pentecost:

There must be something great about community of temporal goods, seeing that it was one of the first fruits of the Holy Ghost. But how different was this communism in the first Christian Church from its caricature in our days. The men who practised community of goods in those days were vessels of the Holy Ghost. Through the Holy Ghost they had become one heart and one soul, and the owners of the lands and houses sold these of their own free will and laid the price at the feet of the Apostles. Hence St. Peter said to Ananias, who had lied to him concerning the prices of the land: "Whilst it remained, did it not remain to thee? And after it was sold, was it not in thy power?" But now those who speak of community of goods are not men filled with the Spirit of God, but with the spirit which the world serves. They do not want to give up what is their own, but to rob others of what by right belongs to them. In those days the idea of community of goods sprang from the spirit of love, whereas now it springs from the spirit of avarice. It is the giant task of our age to fill up again the abyss that divides the rich from the poor, and woe to us if it is not filled up: years will come compared to which the year 'forty-eight was only a childish plaything. But this abyss can be filled up only by the same spirit that wrought in the first Christian community. We must become one heart and one soul again.⁸

The Communism which Ketteler had in mind while giving the course of sermons on "The Great Social Questions of the Day" must therefore be clearly distinguished from the Socialism of a later date. In the development of the argument from St. Thomas, as quoted in this chapter, he dealt with that extreme form of Communism which would extend to an actual common management of industries. In certain instances, during its initial stages, Bolshevism apparently attempted this absurdity. The necessity of leaving the direction of manufacturing plants in the hands of experts, appointed by

⁷ *Ibid.* St. Thomas, *Summa Theologia*, II, II, Q. 66, A. 1 and 2.

⁸ *Predigten*, I, pp. 381 ff Metlake, pp. 67 ff.

the Communist representatives, however, soon became evident. Such would, in general, be the Socialist idea. The more actual a radical movement becomes, the less Communist it is likely to be in its administration. But Socialism, in proportion as it plans a more or less universal socialization of the means of production, still remains economically refuted by the first argument of Bishop Ketteler, which it has never been able to answer, and which experience has proved to be incontrovertible—namely, that collective ownership leads to a far greater expenditure, waste, inefficiency and laziness than private ownership. Our real problem is to retain the efficiency of the latter, and to render impossible the excessive abuses and profiteering that have been connected with it under the Liberalistic capitalism which Bishop Ketteler condemned with all the power of his eloquence.

His opposition to Socialism must not, however, be construed as implying a condemnation of every form of State ownership. The fact is that in later years we find him formally advocating the Government ownership of the railroads in Germany. In spite of its great drawbacks and its inevitably greater expenditure, Government ownership of certain definite industries may be demanded for the common good. So far, but no further, is it then to be accepted, due compensation being made to previous owners. But special care must be taken not to conclude rashly, that because Government ownership in one industry—say the railroads—is successful in one country, that therefore it will be equally successful in every country and all times.

Bishop Ketteler's opposition to Socialism, we must add, was based furthermore upon the atheistic nature of the Socialism of his day, which the International has always maintained in its constant opposition to Christianity, and upon his great personal love for liberty. Hatred of despotism and absolutism, under every form, was one of the strongest traits of his manly character, even as devotion to the cause of human freedom was a consuming passion with him. Socialism, therefore, must of necessity have been abhorrent to his finely sensitive nature which could never permit the rights of others to be trampled under foot. Were ever stronger words than these penned in the cause of popular freedom?

* { Even if all the Utopian dreams of the Socialists were realized, and every one was fed to his heart's content in this universal labor State, yet should I for all that prefer to eat in peace the potatoes planted by my hand and be clothed with the skins of the animals I reared, and therewith *remain free*, than to fare sumptuously in the slavery of the labor State. This makes the collectivist theory utterly detestable. *Slavery come to life again; the State an assemblage of slaves without personal liberty*—that is Socialism!⁹

✓ Socialism, as Bishop Ketteler constantly insisted, was but the child of atheistic Liberalism, and should it ever attain to any temporary power, as he believed was quite probable, would not seek to accomplish the popular will, but true to its Liberalistic origin, would impose its own will upon the people. History has here again proved the truth of his words. Communism and Socialism are in practice to be numbered among the worst forms of human tyranny to which a country can be subjected. Bishop Ketteler had profoundly fathomed the new movement.

C. COOPERATIVE PRODUCTION

Strongly as Bishop Ketteler condemned the fallacies of Socialism, he no less ardently championed the Christian system of co-operative production. Not the public, but the individual workers, would thus be the joint owners of the industries that could be rightfully acquired or established by them. Such a system, obviously, is not more Communistic or Socialistic than any trust or corporation, but is strictly based on the principle of private property, inflexibly defended by Ketteler. It is not to be confused with that "joint possession" which he deprecates in his argument against Communism, but is strictly a private ownership by the workers, who choose their own management and draw their own profits. The time, however, was not as yet ripe for working out the details of and successfully applying this idea which so greatly appealed to him.

On this subject, as is well known, he even addressed an anonymous letter to Lassalle, who was then agitating for co-operative production in Germany. Bishop Ketteler had 50,-

⁹ From the fragments of an unfinished pamphlet by Bishop Ketteler on the subject: "Can a Catholic Workingman be a Member of the Socialist Party?"—Otto Pfülf, S. J., *Bischof von Ketteler*, III, p. 302.

000 *Gulden* at his disposal which he intended to spend in founding five cooperative productive associations for the workers. Incidentally it is interesting to note here that women workers were included as a special division, in his scheme. He desired Lassalle's advice as to a practicable method of procedure, stating at the same time that his position did not make it prudent to mention his name. Lassalle highly praised the Bishop's purpose, but would not enter into details while the name of his correspondent was unknown to him. The Bishop sought counsel elsewhere, and the money finally had to be expended upon a work of charity whose obligation rested upon him.

His interest in the subject did not end here. But the incident just recorded formed the basis of the oft-repeated rumors of an alleged connection between Ketteler and Lassalle. The latter was even said to have been baptized by the Bishop. The fact is that the two men never personally met each other. Lassalle, indeed took public occasion to praise the great ecclesiastic in the most unstinted way for his years of scientific research, his great learning and the reverence with which his words were everywhere received. Yet in their fundamental principles these two most prominent social leaders of their day were worlds apart. Lassalle, in fact, though a foremost promoter of cooperative productive societies, plainly stated at a later period that he had advocated them only as a sop thrown to the people, who demanded something tangible and definite.¹⁰ Of Lassalle's solution by State subventions Bishop Ketteler said:

We believe that a decision to help the working classes by means of subventions such as Lassalle proposes would exceed the competence of a legislative body and encroach on a domain over which the State exercises no power.

Here in brief is the discussion of the question of cooperative productive societies, as we find it given in Ketteler's celebrated book on the relation of the labor question to Christianity:

It is superfluous to insist on the importance of Productive Associations of Workingmen. We cannot foresee whether it will ever be possible to make the whole labor world, or even the bulk of it, share

¹⁰ Metlake, p. 104.

in the benefits they offer. But there is something so grand in the idea itself that it deserves our sympathy in the highest degree. So far as it is realizable, it holds out the most palpable solution of the problem under discussion, assuring as it does to the workman, over and above his daily wages, which competition has practically reduced to a minimum, a new source of revenue. Lassalle wishes to carry out his project with the help of capital advanced by the State. This expedient, at least if carried out on a large scale, appears to us, as we have said before, an unjustifiable encroachment on the rights of private property and impossible of realization without the gravest danger to the public peace. Professor Huber relies partly on the initiative of the workingmen themselves, partly on private donations, and is in favor of beginning everywhere on a small scale.

The question of cooperative societies is, therefore, primarily a question of funds. The great manufacturers of to-day are rich capitalists or companies with millions at their command. The enterprises of the poor workingmen, with little or no capital, will be literally crushed and trampled upon by the giant business concerns which are becoming more numerous every day. Where can the workingmen get the necessary capital to compete with them? If Lassalle's plan is unjustifiable and impracticable, as we are convinced it is, and if there are no other means available than those proposed by Huber, one were inclined to give up the whole idea of cooperative production as a beautiful but barren day-dream, or, at any rate, to cast aside all hope of realizing it to such an extent as would bring relief to any considerable part of the vast army of wage-earners. . . .

As often as I weigh these difficulties, the certainty and the hope spring up within me that the forces of Christianity will take hold of this idea and realize it on a grand scale. Vast sums will be required, and I am far from entertaining the notion that the working-classes will be suddenly and everywhere relieved from their distress by this means. But I see this consummation in the future and hope that Christian souls will begin to lay the foundations for it, now in one place, now in another. Christianity is a force that works from within, advances slowly, but infallibly succeeds in accomplishing the most sublime and unlooked-for things for the welfare of mankind. No doubt many things will happen before the influence of Christianity has gained sufficient ground to attain the desired end. It took centuries before the ancient Romans could be induced to set their slaves free. Perhaps many a Schulze-Delitzsch¹¹ will have to appear on the

¹¹ Hermann Schulze, a Manchestrian economist, was born in Delitzsch, Saxony, 1808. The workingmen's unions founded by him are known as Schulze-Delitzsch associations. He founded the first German loan association at Eilenberg. His trade unions were based upon the false, Liberalistic principles of non-interference on the part of the State in industrial questions. All that the masses needed to hold their own against capital, he claimed, was culture. Societies were consequently founded everywhere to

scene and announce salvation to the working-classes, before the last tower built by the last of them crumbles to pieces and brings home to the workingman that he has been duped once more and that his hopes were vain. Perhaps the world will even have to give Lassalle's program a trial. The disastrous consequences sure to result from this dangerous experiment, especially if it is directed by unscrupulous demagogues, will convince it that the [Social] Democrats are just as powerless to cure it of its ills as are the Liberals, because their philanthropic ideas, too, are built on the quicksands of human speculation and not on the rock of Christianity. We cannot, therefore, tell how and when Christianity will help the working-classes by means of cooperative societies. However, we do not doubt that it will one day realize what is true and good and feasible in the idea. It is true, at the present moment the class that could do most in this matter, viz. the rich merchants, the captains of industry, and the moneyed men generally, is for the most part estranged from Christianity and committed body and soul to the principles of Liberalism. But Christianity counts faithful followers here, too, and its enemies need not always remain such. There was a time when the ancient patrician families of Rome were far removed indeed from Christianity; when a Roman matron daily employed hundreds of slaves to adorn her person; but a time came when the children of these families liberated their slaves, with their fortunes covered Italy with institutions for the poor, and even sacrificed their lives for the love of Christ. Christianity is so wonderful! Its enemy of yesterday falls down today at the foot of the Cross, and the son gives his blood for the love of the God whom his father blasphemed! The resources of Christianity are so boundless that, if God wills to incline the hearts of the Christians to these ideas, the capital required for the creation of productive associations will be gradually provided.

There are two systems of taxation. The one is used by the State, the other by Christianity. The State levies taxes by force. It makes revenue-laws, draws up tax rolls, sends out tax-collectors. Christian-

give a smattering of irreligious, anti-Christian education to the laborer. Trade unionism was thus developed as a part of the Liberalist campaign to promote rationalism and atheism among the masses. The consequence was that the workingman was left hungry as before, but without any consolation of religion to give him strength and comfort in life, so that he might firmly struggle upward towards a true solution of the problem of his own social betterment. Although doubtless of some service, yet these associations were preparing the way for the equally atheistic Socialist unions destined to supplant them. Schulze-Delitzsch was for a time lifted upon a pedestal as the hero of the hour, until Lassalle ruthlessly broke the clay feet of this idol and he came crushing down to earth. Lassalle's doctrines were equally atheistic and equally subversive of the real good of the workingman. Both parties, as Bishop Ketteler said, were right in pointing out the faults of the existing system, and both were wrong in the solutions they themselves proposed.

ity levies taxes by the law of charity. Its assessors and collectors are free-will and conscience. The States of Europe are staggering under the huge burdens of public debt in spite of their compulsory system of taxation, and their financial-embarrassments have given birth to that mystery of iniquity, gambling on the stock-exchange, with all its attendant moral corruption. Christianity, on the contrary, with its system of taxes, has always found abundant means for all its glorious enterprises. Look at our churches and monasteries, our charitable institutions for the relief of every human ailment and distress, our parishes and bishoprics spread over the surface of the globe; think of all the money that has been gathered for the poor, for our schools, our colleges and ancient universities; and remember that all this, with scarcely an exception, is the result of personal sacrifice, and you will have some idea of the life-giving power of Christianity. What Christianity was in past times, such it still is today. If we were to count up all the works of charity founded and supported by voluntary contributions during our own lifetime, what a vast sum should we not arrive at? During the last five years alone the Catholics of the world have sent twenty million florins to the Holy Father. How can we, in the face of these facts, suppose that Christianity will not be able to raise the necessary funds for setting on foot enterprises for the benefit of the working-classes? . . .

In our day, just as in former days, there is no dearth of men who feel impelled to do good to their fellow-men. It seems to me there could hardly be anything more Christian, more pleasing to God, than a society for the organization of cooperative associations on a Christian basis in districts where the distress of the work-people cries loudest for relief.

Above all things, it is necessary that the idea of cooperative associations and the ways and means of organizing them be examined on every side. For only when their importance for the working-classes shall have been recognized on all hands, not least of all by the people themselves, and their feasibility demonstrated, can we hope that the attempts to establish them will be multiplied.¹²

Not only did Bishop Ketteler develop the idea of Christian cooperative productive associations, but he likewise drafted a scheme of copartnership that outlines the essentials of our modern plans. Ketteler would have the business operated under one employer and manager, who should originally be the exclusive owner of it. While retaining for himself a limited number of shares, this employer would then dispose of all

¹² Metlake, pp. 129-133. *Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum*, pp. 138-148.

the rest upon easy terms to his own employees. In view of the difficulties which cooperative production presented, particularly in his day when the workingman was hopelessly impoverished and helplessly held to his grinding task by the Liberalism of the wealthy capitalists, this latter scheme appeared to him as more feasible:

The advantages of these associations are obvious: on the one hand the better class of workmen will in time become owners of the business; whilst, on the other, the drawbacks of the productive associations are obviated by uniformity of management and sufficiency of capital.¹³

He thus hoped to combine the good features of the various organizations, and was determined to begin the work himself, as Metlake says, "by founding a grand central association for the organization of workingmen's associations. From his own revenue he is ready to contribute 5,000 florins annually for six years. . . . He also projected the founding of a People's Bank to be controlled entirely by the workingmen."¹⁴ Such were some of the schemes found among his papers by his biographer, the Rev. Otto Pfülf, S. J., whose great historical work, in three volumes, was published in 1899.¹⁵

Far in advance of his time, and building in a glorious optimism on his firm hope that the future must belong to Christianity, Bishop Ketteler's loftiest plans were not realizable in his own day. They have been repeated, in a way accommodated to our own times, in the American Bishops' program of "Social Reconstruction."

d. KETTELER'S LABOR PROGRAM

While Ketteler looked far into the future he did not neglect the social needs of the immediate present. First and foremost, as he understood, was the need of labor organization. But such associations, to be truly conducive to the common good, must be based upon the principles of Christianity and inspired by its ideals. This truth, so strongly enunciated by Pope Leo

¹³ Metlake, p. 141.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 142.

¹⁵ *Bischof von Ketteler. Eine geschichtliche Darstellung.* See pp. 197-199.

XIII, was no less clearly expressed by Bishop Ketteler, and led to his repeated and in many ways successful efforts, to found Christian labor unions. These, in fact, had reached an extensive development when the *Kulturkampf*, with its Liberalistic aims, practically destroyed them on the absurd contention that they were Socialistic institutions. The Liberalism of today is no less prompt to condemn as Socialistic whatever would limit its arbitrary power or lessen its possibilities of exploiting the laborer or the public. Christian social leaders need never hope to find favor in its eyes. Even Bishop Ketteler himself, like Our Divine Saviour, was accused of stirring up the masses.

In the following passage he traces historically the suppression of the guilds in modern times. These institutions, he well knew, could not have continued in their old form, but called for a transformation and adaptation that would still have enabled them to retain their original spirit. It was this that had made them so effective in the days of their highest development.

The working-classes have passed through the same phases as the old State and the old social order. The Physiocrats of the last century made the organization of labor responsible for all the economic evils of the people, instead of looking for their true origin in its degeneration, its egotistical ossification and in the patent fact that this organization had not been developed to meet changed conditions. And so they annihilated the grand constitution of labor handed on to them by the Middle Ages, instead of reforming it and incorporating with it all those portions of the toiling masses that were still excluded from it. This demolition they called restoration of the natural order — *le gouvernement de la nature*. Organization of labor was in their eyes contrary to nature. They were confident that the destruction of the old organization of labor and the inauguration of their pretended order of nature would bring about world-wide welfare and contentment among the working-classes. They applied their so-called system of nature with such fanaticism that the French National Convention forbade the artisans to discuss their interests in common, because they looked upon such a proceeding as an obstacle to freedom of trade and of intercourse between man and man, and as a revival of the gild system. The politicians acted in exactly the same manner in their province. Complete disorganization of the State, of society, and of labor; the powers of the State vested in a bureaucratic officialdom on the one side, and on the other, unbridled competition amongst the people dissolved into isolated individuals under the sole Control of an absolute monarch

or an equally absolute National Assembly,—this is the natural law of the Revolution. Such too is the spirit of Liberalism, not merely the spirit of its economic teachings but also of its politics and of its social theories. The tendency of our times to return to corporative forms, far from being a product of Liberalism, is on the contrary a reaction against the unnaturalness of its pretended natural law.¹⁶

In his book on Christianity and the labor problem Bishop Ketteler thus further develops his views on labor unionism:

Whoever works for another and is forced to do so all his life, has a moral right to demand security for a permanent livelihood. All the other classes of society enjoy such security. Why should the working-classes alone be deprived of it? Why should the toiler alone have to go to his work, day after day, haunted by the thought: "I do not know whether to-morrow I shall still have the wages on which my existence and the existence of my wife and children depend. Who knows? perhaps to-morrow a crowd of famished workmen will come from afar and rob me of my employment by underbidding me, and my wife or children must work or starve." The wealthy capitalist finds protection a hundredfold in his capital, competition is scarcely more than an idle word for him; but the workman must have no protection: hence the fierce abuse so persistently heaped on the trade guilds. I am far from pretending that the guild system had no weak points. Authority has often been abused; but it has not on that account been abolished. Many abuses, too, crept into the trade guilds for want of proper supervision and timely adjustment to new conditions; but the system itself rested on a right principle, which should have been retained, and could have been retained without detriment to a healthy development of industrial liberty. . . .

The fundamental characteristic of the labor movements of our day, that which gives them their importance and significance and really constitutes their essence, is the tendency, everywhere rife among the workingmen, to organize for the purpose of gaining a hearing for their just claims by united action. To this tendency, which is not only justified but necessary under existing economic conditions, the Church cannot but gladly give her sanction and support.

It would be a great folly on our part if we kept aloof from this movement merely because it happens at the present time to be promoted chiefly by men who are hostile to Christianity. The air remains God's air though breathed by an atheist, and the bread we

¹⁶ Metlake, pp. 210, 211. From analysis of Article XII of Ketteler's socio-political program, published in 1873.

eat is no less the nourishment provided for us by God though kneaded by an unbeliever. It is the same with unionism: it is an idea that rests on the Divine order of things and is essentially Christian, though the men who favor it most do not recognize the finger of God in it and often even turn it to a wicked use.

Unionism however is not merely legitimate in itself and worthy of our support, but Christianity alone commands the indispensable elements for directing it properly and making it a real and lasting benefit to the working classes. Just as the great truths which uplift and educate the workingman, his individuality and personality, are Christian truths, so also Christianity has the great ideas and living forces capable of imparting life and vigor to the workingmen's associations. . . .

When men combine in a Christian spirit, there subsists among them, independently of the direct purpose of their association, a nobler bond which, like a beneficent sun, pours out its light and warmth over all. Faith and charity are for them the source of life and light and vigor. Before they came together to attain a material object, they were already united in this tree of life planted by God on the earth; it is this spiritual union that gives life to their social union. In a word, Christian associations are living organisms; the associations founded under the auspices of modern Liberalism are nothing but agglomerations of individuals held together solely by the hope of present mutual profit or usefulness.

The future of unionism belongs to Christianity. The ancient Christian corporations have been dissolved and men are still zealously at work trying to remove the last remnants, the last stone, of this splendid edifice; a new building is to replace it. But this is only a wretched hut—built upon sand. Christianity must raise a new structure on the old foundations and thus give back to the workingmen's associations their real significance and their real usefulness.¹⁷

Bishop Ketteler was right in pronouncing the doom of the labor unions founded by Liberalism. He was right also in maintaining that while Socialism would probably have its day, the future must belong to Christianity. Certainly there can be no solution of the social problem until the principles of Christianity are recognized. The failure of godless Socialism is as certain as the failure of Liberalistic capitalism. Through sufferings, dissappointments and disillusionments, if in no other way, must mankind again be brought back to Christ, the one

¹⁷ *Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum*, pp. 26 ff. and 130 ff. Metlake, pp. 134, 127 ff.

Truth, and Life and Light of all the world, the one Way for all our social relations, and even for labor unionism.

Here then are some of the principles laid down for capital and labor by the great Bishop, the first leader of the modern Christian social movement. They are taken from his famous sermon on the relation of the labor movement to religion and Christianity, which was preached before about 10,000 workmen at the popular shrine of Our Lady, at the *Liebfrauen-Heide*.¹⁸

He begins by justifying the demand made for an increase of wages, at a time when capitalism was heartlessly despoiling the worker. "Economic Liberalism," he says, "making abstraction of all religion and morality, not only degraded labor to the level of a commodity, but looked on man himself, with his capacity for work, simply as a machine bought as cheaply as possible and driven until it will go no more." Human labor, he proclaims, is not an article of merchandise and may not be simply appraised according to the fluctuations of supply and demand. But while defending the just cause of labor, he no less unerringly points out its duty and the restrictions that religion and morality necessarily place upon it, both for its own and for the common good:

In your efforts to obtain higher wages, you have need of religion and morality in order not to carry your demands too far. We have already seen that there is a limit to the increase of wages. Hence, in our time, when the movements among the working-classes for the amelioration of their material condition are assuming larger proportions from day to day, it is of the highest importance not to exaggerate this demand: the workingman can be only too easily imposed upon and the power of organization used to wrong purposes. The object of the labor movement must not be war between the workingman and the employer, but peace on equitable terms between both.

The impiety of capital, which would treat the workingman like a machine, must be broken. It is a crime against the working-classes; it degrades them. It fits in with the theory of those who would trace man's descent to the ape. But the impiety of labor must also be guarded against. If the movement in favor of higher

¹⁸ *Die Arbeiterbewegung und ihr Streben, im Verhältniss zur Religion und Sittlichkeit*, pp. 4-22. Metlake, pp. 159-171.

wages oversteps the bounds of justice, catastrophes must necessarily ensue, the whole weight of which will recoil on the working-classes. Capitalists are seldom at a loss for lucrative investments. When it comes to the worst they can speculate in Government securities. But the workman is in a far different position. When the business in which he is employed comes to a standstill, unemployment stares him in the face. Besides, exorbitant wage-demands affect not only the large business concerns controlled by the capitalists, but also the smaller ones in the hands of the middle classes and the daily earnings of master-workmen and handicraftsmen. But if the working-classes are to observe just moderation in their demands, if they are to escape the danger of becoming mere tools in the hands of ambitious and unscrupulous demagogues, if they wish to keep clear of the inordinate selfishness which they condemn so severely in the capitalist, they must be filled with a lofty moral sense, their ranks must be made up of courageous, Christian, religious men. The power of money without religion is an evil, but the power of organized labor without religion is just as great an evil. Both lead to destruction.¹⁹

This certainly is a wholesome lesson that retains its full force today, or rather is doubly applicable now.

In the next place he considers the workingman's demand for shorter hours. Hours of labor were then, as a consequence of the irreligious Liberalism, often inhumanly long. A Trade Law was enacted in 1869 which at least limited the work of boys between fourteen and sixteen years to ten hours. But the law itself was not observed, and Ketteler protested that it must be applied to all workers alike. This was a step vastly in advance of his time. He further insisted on the inexorable enforcement of such legislation by the most feasible means, to which we shall later have occasion to refer.

While the demand for reasonable hours is strongly sustained by Ketteler, he would never have countenanced the exaggerated demands so common today for an unreasonable shortening of hours which means under-production in industry and suffering for the people, and which can only end in moral as well as economic ruin for the workers. There is a limit beyond which hours cannot be shortened, though in some industries there is doubtless reason for shorter hours than in others. Shorter hours themselves, as Ketteler earnestly warns the

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

workers, will be of no avail to them if they squander their leisure time in irreligion and immorality. This again is a truth to be brought home today, when the deflection from the Faith of their fathers has robbed men both of joy in their work and of happiness in their homes, which in countless instances are broken up by the pagan evil of divorce. To quote the words of Bishop Ketteler:

Wherever capitalists, ignoring the dignity of man, have acted on the principles of modern political economy, wages have been reduced to a minimum and working hours have been prolonged to the limits of human endurance, and beyond them. The workman cannot be kept going day and night, like a machine, but for all that the impossible was expected from him. Hence, wherever the hours of work are lengthened beyond the limits fixed by nature, the workingmen have an indisputable right to combat this abuse of the power of wealth by well-directed concerted action.

But here again, my dear workmen, the real value of your efforts depends on religion and morality. If the workman uses the hour thus put at his disposal to fulfil in the bosom of his family the duties of a good father or a dutiful son, to tend to the affairs of the house, to cultivate the plot of ground he calls his own, then this hour will be of untold value to himself and his family. If, on the contrary, he throws it away in bad company, on the streets, in the tavern, it will neither profit his health nor his temporal or spiritual prosperity. It will simply serve to undermine his constitution, to disfigure the image of God in his soul, and to dissipate his wages all the more quickly and surely.²⁰

These truths are again insisted upon where he speaks of the third demand of the working people: days of rest. This demand, he says, is perfectly legitimate. "The culprits are not merely the wealthy *entrepreneurs* who force their workmen to work on Sundays, but also all tradesmen, landowners and masters generally who deprive their servants, 'hands' or clerks of their well-earned Sunday rest." Liberalism counted up the Sundays and holydays of the Church and lamented hypocritically the loss in wages they implied to the worker. The simple solution, Bishop Ketteler tells them, "would be to give the worker as much pay for six days' work as he now receives for seven." The logic of such an argument was beyond the capa-

²⁰ *Ibid.*

city of Liberalism to comprehend. Yet for the workman, too, the great friend of labor has a word of earnest counsel:

But, my dear workmen, it is not enough that the labor leaders and the labor organs insist on days of rest. Each one of you must work to this end by scrupulously keeping holy the Sabbath Day. There are still, unfortunately, very many workmen, who, without being obliged, and simply for lucre's sake, work on Sundays. Such men sin not merely against God and His commandment, but really and truly against the whole body of work-people, because by their base cupidity they furnish the employers with a ready-made excuse for refusing days of rest to all without exception. May all the workpeople, not excepting the servant-girl whom a heartless mistress over-burdens with work, and the humble railway-employee for whom wealthy corporations have made Sunday a dead letter, with one voice reclaim this right as a right of man. To what purpose have the so-called rights of man been laid down in our Constitutions so long as capital is free to trample them under foot?

It is certain that you have religion on your side in your demand for days of rest; it is certain also that all the efforts of the working-classes would be of no avail if they were not sustained by the power of religion and the Divine Precept: "Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath Day." But it is no less certain that this weekly day of rest will profit you, your health, your soul, your families, from whom your work keeps you away so much during the week, only if you remain intimately united with the Church. Without religion the days of rest will serve no other purpose than to bring ruin on the workman and his family. What is called "blue Monday" is nothing else but Sunday spent without religion. . . . Your own experience is able to furnish you with examples enough of the vast difference between a workingman's family in which the day of rest is spent in harmony with the principles of religion and one in which religion is ignored. A Christian Sunday is a blessing; a Sunday passed in the saloon, in bad company, in drunkenness, in impurity, is a curse.²¹

These thoughts are further developed by him in a pastoral letter that incidentally describes, in Ketteler's happy vein, the spiritual significance of the change from work-a-day clothes to the Sunday attire. Labor, he says, recalls to mind the punishment God has attached to sin. No one is to seek to avoid his due task, or fail religiously to perform it, in whatever trade, profession, or employment he may be engaged. On the other

²¹ *Ibid.*

hand, the days of rest are to be regarded as a foretaste of the time when God would lift from us our burdens. So, therefore, he tells the laborer:

When you lay aside your work-day clothes and put on your Sunday dress, it should remind you that you are approaching the day when the Saviour Himself will divest you of the garments of servitude and sin, and will put upon you, for all eternity, the robe and the ring of a child of God, the veritable Sunday attire.²²

On the fourth demand made by the working classes of the day—the prohibition of child labor in factories—he expresses himself in strongest terms. As early as the year 1869 he lays down the rule that no child should be permitted to work in a factory under the age of fourteen, and in his discussion elsewhere of the Trade Law of June 21, 1869, he positively states that even the age of fourteen is too early to remove a child from the atmosphere of the home. The child's character, he there argues, is not sufficiently formed as yet to resist the temptations and evil influences to which factory life is likely to expose it. In the following statement concerning the workers' demand in this matter he obviously insists merely upon what he regards the maximum then attainable:

I regret to say that this demand is not as general as it ought to be, and that many workmen send their children to the mills and factories in order to increase their income. It would be more correct to say that it is a demand made by certain spokesmen of the labor organizations. Fritzsche, the president of the Cigar Makers' Union, has been especially active in this matter. He brought in a motion in the Parliament of the North German Confederation to have child labor prohibited by law. Unfortunately his motion was thrown out. Child labor was restricted but not forbidden. I deplore this action of the legislature profoundly, and look on it as a victory of materialism over moral principles. My own observations are in full accord with the statements of Fritzsche on the bad effects of factory labor on children. I know right well what arguments are brought forward to excuse it, and I am also aware that even some who are well-disposed toward the working-classes wish to see child labor tolerated to a certain extent. Children are in duty bound, these men argue, to help their parents in the labors of the house and the field, why debar them from the factory? These people forget

²² *Hirtenbriefe*, pp. 169, 170.

that there is a vast difference between work at home and work in a factory. Factory work quenches, as it were, the family spirit in the child, and this is, as we shall see presently, the greatest danger that threatens the working-classes in our day. Moreover, it robs the child of the time it should devote to innocent, joyous recreation so necessary at this period of life. Lastly, the factory undermines the bodily and spiritual health of the child. I regard child labor in factories as a monstrous cruelty of our time, a cruelty committed against the child by the spirit of the age and the selfishness of parents. I look on it as a slow poisoning of the body and the soul of the child. With the sacrifice of the joys of childhood, with the sacrifice of health, with the sacrifice of innocence, the child is condemned to increase the profits of the *entrepreneur* and oftentimes to earn bread for parents whose dissolute life has made them incapable of doing so themselves. Hence I rejoice at every word spoken in favor of the workingman's child. Religion in its great love for children cannot but support the demand for the prohibition of child labor in factories. You, my dear workmen, can second this demand most efficaciously by never permitting your own children under fourteen years of age to work in a factory.²³

The fifth demand of the workers to which he calls attention is "that women, especially mothers of families, be prohibited from working in factories." With this desire Ketteler heartily sympathized, although he fully understood the economic stress that often drove woman into the factory. Like every Catholic sociologist he insists: "Religion wants the mother to pass the day at home in order that she may fulfill her high and holy mission towards her husband and her children," and so, as he needed not to add, towards society. This did not imply that other social duties were not incumbent upon her, but only in such measure as would not interfere with her first and greatest duty in the home. Aside from the considerations of wifehood and motherhood, "the proportion of women in industry," as the American Bishops have well said, "ought to be kept within the smallest practical limits."²⁴ But the duty of motherhood is entirely incompatible with such work: "If the mother is snatched from her sacred home duties," said Bishop Ketteler in connection with the Trade Law referred to above, "and turned into a wage-earning workwoman, there can be no question of

²³ *Die Arbeiterbewegung*, etc., I. c.

²⁴ *Social Reconstruction*, p. 13.

a Christian family." Destroying the Christian family you destroy all hope of true social progress.

Hence also the complete agreement on the part of Bishop Ketteler with the sixth demand of labor which he says follows as a corollary from the former, that: "Young girls should not in future be employed in factory work." In this connection he already mentions the argument that because girls can live for far less than a workingman, their indiscriminate employment must necessarily have a depressing effect upon the scale of wages paid to men. But his great reason is drawn from the prejudicial consequences to the morals of the girls and so of the future families of the land:

Workmen themselves have repeatedly called attention to these sad consequences. In their meetings such striking argumentation as the following has been heard: "We want good and happy families; but to have good and happy families we must have pure, virtuous mothers; now, where can we find these if our young girls are lured into the factories and are there inoculated with the germs of impudence and immorality?" I cannot tell you, my dear workmen, how deeply such words coming from the ranks of the working-classes touched and gladdened my heart. Ten years ago, when the labor movement was still in its infancy among us, such sentiments were hardly heard anywhere except from our Christian pulpits. The Liberals were insensible to the moral dangers to which the daughters of the workman were exposed. When these poor creatures were utterly corrupted in the factory, their employers still had the effrontery to pose as their benefactors, because, thanks to them, they were earning so many cents a day. The dangers of factory life to the morals of the young working-girls, and therefore to the family of the workman, are beginning to be recognized more and more even by the factory-owners themselves. This is a happy symptom and shows once more that the labor question, like all other great social questions, is in the last analysis a question of religion and morality.²⁵

At the famous Fulda Conference of the German Bishops, in September, 1869, Bishop Ketteler read his epoch-making paper "On the Care of the Church for Factory Workpeople, Journeymen, Apprentices and Servant Girls." After showing the duty of the Church to help in the solution of this problem,

²⁵ Op. cit.

he descended to a consideration of specific measures to be adopted. Mentioning the eleven divisions under which the official report of the Prize Jury of the Paris Exposition had grouped its proposed remedies, he added the following program of "Legal Protections for Workingmen":

1. Prohibition of child labor in factories.
2. Limitation of working-hours for lads employed in factories, in the interest of their corporal and intellectual welfare.
3. Separation of the sexes in the workshops.
4. Closing of unsanitary workshops.
5. Legal regulation of working hours.
6. Sunday rest.
7. Obligation of caring for workmen who, through no fault of theirs, are temporarily or forever incapacitated for work in the business in which they are employed.
8. A law protecting and favoring cooperative associations of workmen.
9. Appointment by the State of factory inspectors.²⁶

It will be noticed that we have not progressed far, if at all, beyond the position occupied more than half a century ago by this progressive Catholic Bishop. He drew up his program, let us further remember, almost a quarter of a century before the publication of the great Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, on the "Condition of the Working Classes." Nor have we gone beyond him in our methods of enforcing such legislation as has been passed by us, when indeed we do not merely accumulate a ridiculous mass of petty regulations and forthwith forget all about them, or conveniently ignore their existence. On this point the Bishop says elsewhere in his famous draught of a political program which he hoped might be accepted by all men of good will:

But all these laws will afford no efficacious protection to the working classes unless their observance is everywhere assured by legal control. Whether the best means of control would be to appoint factory inspectors, as is done in England, or to choose supervisors from among the workpeople themselves, as some propose to do, or to combine both systems, is a question we do not venture to pronounce upon. Whatever be the method adopted, however, the con-

²⁶ Metlake, pp. 180, 181.

trol must be extended to *moral* and *sanitary* conditions in the workshops.²⁷

In the brochure referred to here Bishop Ketteler lays down a complete national program, political, religious, educational, as well as social. Under the latter subject we may group the two following clauses:

XI. Regulation of the public debt, diminution of the public burdens, proper adjustment of taxes. We propose the following ameliorations:

1. Introduction of a stock exchange tax. (Such laws were later introduced in 1885, 1894, 1900, 1905.)
2. Introduction of an income tax for joint stock companies. (Actualized in the law of July 27, 1885.)
3. State management of railways. (Actualized at the end of the 'seventies.)
4. Reduction of the war budget. (Bishop Ketteler's advice was not followed. Well for all if it had been!)

5. Exemption of the necessities of life from taxation.

XII. Corporate reorganization of the working classes.

1. Legal protection of the children and wives of workmen against the exploitation of capital.
2. Protection of the workman's strength by laws regulating hours of labor and Sunday rest.
3. Legal protection of the health and morality of work people in mines, factories, workshops, etc.
4. Appointment of inspectors to watch over the carrying out of the factory laws.²⁸

If in answer to these demands for social legislation Bismarck gave Germany the *Kulturkampf*, yet Ketteler and not Bismarck triumphed in the end; and his reforms won the day. But great was to be the sea of bitterness that was to engulf the people when in spite of the voice of Ketteler and his Catholic countrymen, so many turned from Christianity to the godless Socialism of Marx, Engels, Bebel, Liebknecht and the rest. The same was to be true of other great nations. Labor, in turning from Christ, can only find its own undoing. Splendidly did Ketteler express this truth in the very last Pastorals addressed to his flock. Here is his chain of social logic whose every link is purest gold:

²⁷ *Die Katholiken im deutschen Reiche*. Metlake, 213, 214.

²⁸ *Ibid.* Metlake, p. 208.

The most fatal error of our time is the delusion that mankind can be made happy without religion and Christianity. There are certain truths which cling together like the links of a chain: they cannot be torn asunder because God has joined them. Among these truths are the following:

There is no true morality without God, no right knowledge of God without Christ, no real Christ without His Church. Where the Church is not, there true knowledge of God perishes. Where true knowledge of God is not, there morality succumbs in the struggle with sin, with selfishness and sensuality, with the lust of the eyes, the lust of the flesh, and the pride of life. But where morality is not, there is no means left of making the people happy and prosperous. In such a state men are ruled by their passions. They are the slaves of the tyrants of avarice and lust, in whose service the powerful oppress the weak, and the weak in their turn rise up against the powerful, and if they conquer, become the willing tools of the self-same tyrants, their passions. War without end will be waged between the rich and the poor; peace on earth among them is impossible. Intimately, inseparably, is the welfare of the people bound up with religion and morality.

A perfectly just distribution of the goods of earth will never take place, because God has entrusted the higher moral order to the free will of men, only a portion of whom subject their will to God. But in a truly Christian nation the difference between the rich and poor will always be adjusted in the best possible way.²⁹

There are finally those who believe today, as in the days of Ketteler, that the one solution of all our problems is ultimately to be found in education. Not religion, but education, they tell us, is the need of the masses. The school of Schulze-Delitzsch still exists among us. Its followers are legion. Into their teeth Ketteler casts the hard and obstinate fact of Original Sin, digest it as they may:

Of course the children of the world will not admit this. They laugh at the doctrine of original sin and its consequences; they deny the origin and the power of the passions, and pretend that these are only the result of ignorance. According to them, a better organization of the school would suffice to destroy the empire of the passions; and by a better organization of the school they understand, in the first place, the separation of the school from the Church and the diffusion of the so-called general culture. . . .

But I ask you, what assertion strikes truth more insolently in

²⁹ *Hirtenbriefe*, p. 923. Metlake, p. 224.

the face than this? If it were true, it would follow that there must be two classes of men on earth: the men furnished with general human culture, a race without passions, without vices, acting only conformably to the dictates of higher reason, and the men deprived of general culture, and in consequence the slaves of all kinds of passions and vices. Now I ask you, is this true? Or can you think of a more impudent lie? How can such assertions be made at a time when the most accurate statistics in France and Germany have proved that neither the degree of culture nor the degree of material well-being have the slightest influence on the number of crimes committed in a country. But why be at pains for proofs when daily experience speaks louder than statistical tables? Is the miser who heaps treasures upon treasures; is the young man who traverses the habitable globe, learns all the languages of men, knows all peoples, and sacrifices thousands a year to his pleasures without bestowing even a passing thought on his poor brothers; is the young girl who shines in society, who makes a golden calf of her body and adores it and offers it sacrifice of gold and precious stones while she pitilessly leaves her poor sisters to die of want and exposure,—are all these perhaps too Christianly educated, or do they lack general human culture?

Where is this boasted general human culture that makes the miser benevolent, that fills the breast of the profligate youth, the vain-glorious maiden, with true charity for their neighbor? Where is the doctrine, where is the book that can implant in the human heart the spirit of Christian renouncement, of self-denial? Show me, show me the generation imbued with the true charity, reared without Christianity by our worldly wisdom alone, and I am ready to cast Christianity overboard with you.

The world has separated itself from Christ; it has rejected Redemption in Christ; it has submitted to the dominion of its passions; this is the last, the profoundest, and truest reason of our social misery. It is not because he is ignorant and without general human culture, but because he has become the wretched slave of avarice and pleasure-seeking, that the rich man despises the command of God: Thou shalt give of thy abundance to the poor. And it is not because he did not learn his lessons well at school, but because he serves sloth like a slave, that the poor man stretches out his hand after the goods of others and despises the command of God: Thou shalt not steal. Guided by their sinful passions, men are no longer able to apprehend even the simplest natural truths that run counter to these passions. Apostasy from Christianity is the cause of our wretched state: if we shut our eyes to this truth we are undone. Just as the individual can make true progress only if he recognizes that he cannot fulfil the high purpose of his existence unless aided from without so the world will not raise itself out of its present

desperate state until it is convinced that, without external aid, it cannot solve the great problems which it must solve at any cost or relapse into barbarism.³⁰

Bishop Ketteler more than contributed his share towards the solution of this problem. No references whatsoever have been made here to his numberless works of charity. Among the labor projects undertaken or actively urged by him may be numbered the founding of homes for servant girls;³¹ the introduction of the journeyman's associations, which owed no little to the advice given by him to their worthy founder, Father Kolping;³² the proposed establishment of a society for the building of workingmen's homes, that was a favorite plan with him;³³ the creation of workingmen's associations, which ultimately resulted in the development of the flourishing Christian-social labor unions with almost 200,000 members in 1870, and promising to soar high into the hundreds of thousands when they were ruthlessly trampled to death under the cloven heel of the *Kulturkampf*; and finally, to proceed no further, the promotion of loan and credit banks for the welfare of the laboring classes.³⁴ His still larger schemes of cooperative production by the workers and copartnership plans were not to ripen in his own day. He clearly saw the difficulties and hoped that Christianity would in due time afford the solution. His immediately practical and specific labor measures, however, were to be successfully championed by the Center that gave to Bishop Ketteler the credit of its enlightened social program. But his influence was to extend much farther and reach out over all the world, for rightly did Pope Leo XIII call him "my precursor in the social field."

³⁰ *Predigten*, II, pp. 136-142. Metlake, pp. 44-46.

³¹ J. Mundwiler, S. J., *Bischof v. Ketteler*, p. 52.

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 54, 55, 110.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 101.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 104.

II. THREE SOVEREIGN PONTIFFS

1. ENCYCLICAL OF POPE LEO XIII, ON THE CONDITION OF THE WORKING CLASSES
2. ENCYCLICAL OF POPE LEO XIII, ON CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY
3. APOSTOLIC LETTER OF POPE PIUS X TO THE BISHOPS OF ITALY, ON CATHOLIC SOCIAL ACTION
4. EXTRACTS FROM THE LETTER OF POPE PIUS X, CONDEMNING *Le Sillon*
5. ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF POPE PIUS X TO THE BISHOPS OF GERMANY, ON TRADE UNIONS
6. LETTER OF POPE BENEDICT XV TO THE HIERARCHY OF FRANCE
7. LETTER OF POPE BENEDICT XV TO M. EUGENE DUTHOIT
8. LETTER OF POPE BENEDICT XV TO THE BISHOP OF BERGAMO

1. THE CONDITION OF THE WORKING CLASSES ¹

Encyclical Letter *Rerum Novarum*, May 15, 1891

BY POPE LEO XIII

THAT the spirit of revolutionary change, which has long been disturbing the nations of the world, should have passed beyond the sphere of politics and made its influence felt in the cognate sphere of practical economics is not surprising. The elements of the conflict now raging are unmistakable: in the vast expansion of industrial pursuits and the marvellous discoveries of science; in the changed relations between masters and workmen; in the enormous fortunes of some few individuals, and the utter poverty of the masses; in the increased self-reliance and closer mutual combination of the working classes; as also, finally, in the prevailing moral degeneracy. The momentous gravity of the state of things now obtaining fills every mind with painful apprehension; wise men are discussing it; practical men are proposing schemes; popular meetings, legislatures, and rulers of nations are all busied with it — and actually there is no question which has taken a deeper hold on the public mind.

Therefore, Venerable Brethren, as on former occasions when it seemed opportune to refute false teaching, We have addressed you in the interests of the Church and of the commonwealth, and have issued Letters bearing on "Political Power," "Human Liberty," "The Christian Constitution of the State," and like matters, so have We thought it expedient now to speak on the condition of the working classes. It is a subject on which We have already touched more than once,

¹ This is the greatest pronouncement made by any of the Popes on the social question. It is as pertinent today as when it was written, more than twenty-nine years ago, because it sets forth the eternal principles of social justice. The reader is urged to read the review of the Encyclical by Cardinal Manning which appears on a later page of this volume.

incidentally. But in the present Letter, the responsibility of the Apostolic office urges us to treat the question of set purpose and in detail, in order that no misapprehension may exist as to the principles which truth and justice dictate for its settlement. The discussion is not easy, nor is it void of danger. It is no easy matter to define the relative rights and mutual duties of the rich and of the poor, of capital and of labor. And the danger lies in this, that crafty agitators are intent on making use of these differences of opinion to pervert men's judgments and to stir up the people to revolt.

But all agree, and there can be no question whatever, that some remedy must be found, and found quickly, for the misery and wretchedness pressing so heavily and unjustly at this moment on the vast majority of the working classes.

For the ancient workingmen's guilds were abolished in the last century, and no other organization took their place. Public institutions and the very laws have set aside the ancient religion. Hence by degrees it has come to pass that workingmen have been surrendered, all isolated and helpless, to the hard-heartedness of employers and the greed of unchecked competition. The mischief has been increased by rapacious usury, which, although more than once condemned by the Church, is nevertheless, under a different guise, but with the like injustice, still practised by covetous and grasping men. To this must be added the custom of working by contract, and the concentration of so many branches of trade in the hands of a few individuals; so that a small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the teeming masses of the laboring poor a yoke little better than that of slavery itself.

SOCIALISTS AND PRIVATE PROPERTY

To remedy these wrongs the Socialists, working on the poor man's envy of the rich, are striving to do away with private property, and contend that individual possessions should become the common property of all, to be administered by the State or by municipal bodies. They hold that by thus transferring property from private individuals to the community, the present mischievous state of things will be set to rights, inasmuch

as each citizen will then get his fair share of whatever there is to enjoy. But their contentions are so clearly powerless to end the controversy that were they carried into effect the workingman himself would be among the first to suffer. They are, moreover, emphatically unjust, because they would rob the lawful possessor, bring State action into a sphere not within its competence, and create utter confusion in the community.

It is surely undeniable that, when a man engages in remunerative labor, the impelling reason and motive of his work is to obtain property, and thereafter to hold it as his very own. If one man hires out to another his strength or skill, he does so for the purpose of receiving in return what is necessary for sustenance and education; he therefore expressly intends to acquire a right full and real, not only to the remuneration, but also to the disposal of such remuneration, just as he pleases. Thus, if he lives sparingly, saves money, and, for greater security, invests his savings in land, the land, in such case, is only his wages under another form; and, consequently, a workingman's little estate thus purchased should be as completely at his full disposal as are the wages he receives for his labor. But it is precisely in such power of disposal that ownership consists, whether the property consist of land or chattels. Socialists, therefore, by endeavoring to transfer the possessions of individuals to the community, strike at the interests of every wage earner, for they deprive him of the liberty of disposing of his wages, and thus of all hope and possibility of increasing his stock and of bettering his condition in life.

MAN'S NATURAL RIGHT TO PRIVATE PROPERTY

What is of still greater importance, however, is that the remedy they propose is manifestly against justice. For every man has by nature the right to possess property as his own. This is one of the chief points of distinction between man and the animal creation. For the brute has no power of self-direction, but is governed by two chief instincts, which keep his powers alert, move him to use his strength, and determine him to action without the power of choice. These instincts are self-preservation and the propagation of the species. Both can at-

tain their purpose by means of things which are close at hand; beyond their surroundings the brute creation cannot go, for they are moved to action by sensibility alone, and by the things which sense perceives. But with man it is different indeed. He possesses, on the one hand, the full perfection of animal nature, and therefore he enjoys, at least, as much the rest of the animal race, the fruition of the things of the body. But animality, however perfect, is far from being the whole of humanity, and is indeed humanity's humbled handmaid, made to serve and obey. It is the mind, or the reason, which is the chief thing in us who are human beings; it is this which makes a human being human, and distinguishes him essentially and completely from the brute. And on this account—viz., that man alone among animals possesses reason—it must be within his right to have things not merely for temporary and momentary use, as other living beings have them, but in stable and permanent possession; he must have not only things which perish in the using, but also those, which though used, remain for use in the future.

This becomes still more clearly evident if we consider man's nature a little more deeply. For man, comprehending by the power of his reason things innumerable, and joining the future with the present—being, moreover, the master of his own acts—governs himself by the foresight of his counsel, under the eternal law and the power of God, Whose Providence governs all things. Wherefore it is in his power to exercise his choice not only on things which regard his present welfare, but also on those which will be for his advantage in time to come. Hence man not only can possess the fruits of the earth, but also the earth itself; for of the products of the earth he can make provision for the future. Man's needs do not die out, but recur; satisfied to-day, they demand new supplies to-morrow. Nature, therefore, owes to man a storehouse that shall never fail, the daily supply of his daily wants. And this he finds only in the inexhaustible fertility of the earth. Nor must we, at this stage, have recourse to the State.

MAN IS OLDER THAN THE STATE

And he holds the right of providing for the life of his body prior to the formation of any State. And to say that God has given the earth to the use and enjoyment of the universal human race is not to deny that there can be private property. For God has granted the earth to mankind in general; not in the sense that all without distinction can deal with it as they please, but rather that no part of it has been assigned to any one in particular, and that the limits of private possession have been left to be fixed by man's own industry and the laws of individual peoples. Moreover, the earth, though divided among private owners, ceases not thereby to minister to the needs of all; for there is no one who does not live on what the land brings forth. Those who do not possess the soil, contribute their labor; so that it may be truly said that all human subsistence is derived either from labor on one's own land, or from some laborious industry which is paid for either in the produce of the land itself or in that which is exchanged for what the land brings forth.

Here, again, we have another proof that private ownership is according to nature's law. For that which is required for the preservation of life and for life's well-being, is produced in great abundance by the earth, but not until man has brought it into cultivation and lavished upon it his care and skill. Now, when man thus spends the industry of his mind and the strength of his body in procuring the fruits of nature, by that act he makes his own that portion of nature's field which he cultivates—that portion on which he leaves, as it were, the impress of his own personality; and it cannot but be just that he should possess that portion as his own, and should have a right to keep it without molestation.

These arguments are so strong and convincing that it seems surprising that certain obsolete opinions should now be revived in opposition to what is here laid down. We are told that it is right for private persons to have the use of the soil and the fruits of their land, but that it is unjust for anyone to possess as owner either the land on which he has built or the estate which he has cultivated. But those who assert this do not

perceive that they are robbing man of what his own labor has produced. For the soil which is tilled and cultivated with toil and skill utterly changes its condition; it was wild before, it is now fruitful; it was barren, and now it brings forth in abundance. That which has thus altered and improved it becomes so truly part of itself as to be in a great measure indistinguishable and inseparable from it. Is it just that the fruit of a man's sweat and labor should be enjoyed by another? As effects follow their cause, so it is just and right that the results of labor should belong to him who has labored.

With reason, therefore, the common opinion of mankind, little affected by the few dissentients who have maintained the opposite view, has found in the study of nature, and in the law of nature herself, the foundations of the division of property, and has consecrated by the practice of all ages the principle of private ownership, as being preeminently in conformity with human nature, and as conducing in the most unmistakable manner to the peace and tranquility of human life. The same principle is confirmed and enforced by the civil laws—laws which, as long as they are just, derive their binding force from the law of nature. The authority of the Divine Law adds its sanction, forbidding us in the gravest terms even to covet that which is another's:—*Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife; nor his house, nor his field, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything which is his.*²

MAN'S NATURAL RIGHT AND HIS SOCIAL AND DOMESTIC DUTIES

The rights here spoken of, belonging to each individual man, are seen in a much stronger light if they are considered in relation to man's social and domestic obligations.

In choosing a state of life, it is indisputable that all are at full liberty either to follow the counsel of Jesus Christ as to virginity, or to enter into the bonds of marriage. No human law can abolish the natural and primitive right of marriage, or in any way limit the chief and principal purpose of mar-

² Deuteronomy v, 21.

riage, ordained by God's authority from the beginning. *Increase and multiply.*³ Thus we have the Family; the "society" of a man's own household; a society limited indeed in numbers, but a true "society," anterior to every kind of State or nation, with rights and duties of its own, totally independent of the commonwealth.

That right of property, therefore, which has been proved to belong naturally to individual persons, must also belong to a man in his capacity of head of a family; nay, such a person must possess this right so much the more clearly in proportion as his position multiplies his duties. For it is a most sacred law of nature that a father must provide food and all necessities for those whom he has begotten; and, similarly, nature dictates that a man's children, who carry on, as it were, and continue his own personality, should be provided by him with all that is needful to enable them honorably to keep themselves from want and misery in the uncertainties of this mortal life. Now, in no other way can a father effect this except by the ownership of profitable property, which he can transmit to his children by inheritance. A family, no less than a State, is, as we have said, a true society, governed by a power within itself, that is to say, by the father. Wherefore, provided the limits be not transgressed which are prescribed by the very purposes for which it exists, the Family has, at least, equal rights with the State in the choice and pursuit of those things which are needful to its preservation and its just liberty.

We say, at least equal rights; for since the domestic household is anterior both in idea and in fact to the gathering of men into a commonwealth, the former must necessarily have rights and duties which are prior to those of the latter, and which rest more immediately on nature. If the citizens of a State—that is to say, the Families—on entering into association and fellowship, experienced at the hands of the State hindrance instead of help, and found their rights attacked instead of being protected, such association were rather to be repudiated than sought after.

³ Genesis i, 28.

THE STATE MAY NOT ABOLISH NOR ABSORB PATERNAL
RIGHTS

The idea, then, that the civil government should, at its own discretion, penetrate and pervade the family and the household, is a great and pernicious mistake. True, if a family finds itself in great difficulty, utterly friendless, and without prospect of help, it is right that extreme necessity be met by public aid; for each family is a part of the commonwealth. In like manner, if within the walls of the household there occur grave disturbance of mutual rights, the public power must interfere to force each party to give the other what is due; for this is not to rob citizens of their rights, but justly and properly to safeguard and strengthen them. But the rulers of the State must go no further: nature bids them stop here. Paternal authority can neither be abolished by the State nor absorbed; for it has the same source as human life itself; "the child belongs to the father," and is, as it were, the continuation of the father's personality; and, to speak with strictness, the child takes its place in civil society not in its own right, but in its quality as a member of the family in which it is begotten. And it is for the very reason that "the child belongs to the father," that, as St. Thomas of Aquin says, "before it attains the use of free-will, it is in the power and care of its parents."⁴ The Socialists, therefore, in setting aside the parent and introducing the providence of the State, act *against natural justice*, and threaten the very existence of family life.

And such interference is not only unjust, but is quite certain to harass and disturb all classes of citizens, and to subject them to odious and intolerable slavery. It would open the door to envy, to evil speaking, and to quarrelling; the sources of wealth would themselves run dry, for no one would have any interest in exerting his talents or his industry; and that ideal equality of which so much is said would, in reality, be the leveling down of all to the same condition of misery and dishonor.

Thus it is clear that the main tenet of *Socialism*, the community of goods, must be utterly rejected; for it would injure

⁴ St. Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, 2a 2æ Q. x. Art. 12.

those whom it is intended to benefit, it would be contrary to the natural rights of mankind, and it would introduce confusion and disorder into the commonwealth. Our first and most fundamental principle, therefore, when we undertake to alleviate the condition of the masses, must be the inviolability of private property. This laid down, We go on to show where we must find the remedy that we seek.

THE CHURCH ALONE CAN SOLVE THE SOCIAL PROBLEM

We approach the subject with confidence, and in the exercise of the rights which belong to Us. For no practical solution of this question will ever be found without the assistance of Religion and of the Church. It is We who are the chief guardian of Religion, and the chief dispenser of what belongs to the Church, and we must not by silence neglect the duty which lies upon Us. Doubtless this most serious question demands the attention and the efforts of others besides Ourselves — of the rulers of States, of employers of labor, of the wealthy, and of the working population themselves for whom We plead. But We affirm without hesitation that all the striving of men will be vain if they leave out the Church. It is the Church that proclaims from the Gospel those teachings by which the conflict can be put an end to, or at least made far less bitter; the Church uses its efforts not only to enlighten the mind, but to direct by its precepts the life and conduct of men; the Church improves and ameliorates the condition of the working man by numerous useful organizations; does its best to enlist the services of all ranks in discussing and endeavoring to meet, in the most practical way, the claims of the working classes; and acts on the decided view that for these purposes recourse should be had, in due measure and degree, to the help of the law and of State authority.

Let it be laid down, in the first place, that humanity must remain as it is. It is impossible to reduce human society to a level. The Socialists may do their utmost, but all striving against nature is vain. There naturally exist among mankind innumerable differences of the most important kind; people differ in capability, in diligence, in health, and in strength;

and unequal fortune is a necessary result of inequality in condition. Such inequality is far from being disadvantageous either to individuals or to the community; social and public life can only go on by the help of various kinds of capacity and the playing of many parts, and each man, as a rule, chooses the part which peculiarly suits his case. As regards bodily labor, even had man never fallen from *the state of innocence*, he would not have been wholly unoccupied; but that which would then have been his free choice, his delight, became afterwards compulsory, and the painful expiation of his sin. *Cursed be the earth in thy work; in thy labor thou shalt eat of it all the days of thy life.*⁵ In like manner, the other pains and hardships of life will have no end or cessation on this earth; for the consequences of sin are bitter and hard to bear, and they must be with man as long as life lasts. To suffer and to endure, therefore, is the lot of humanity; let men try as they may, no strength and no artifice will ever succeed in banishing from human life the ills and troubles which beset it. If any there are who pretend differently — who hold out to a hard-pressed people freedom from pain and trouble, undisturbed repose, and constant enjoyment — they cheat the people and impose upon them, and their lying promises will only make the evil worse than before. There is nothing more useful than to look at the world as it really is — and at the same time look elsewhere for a remedy to its troubles.

THE CHRISTIAN INTERDEPENDENCE OF CAPITAL AND LABOR

The great mistake that is made in the matter now under consideration, is to possess oneself of the idea that class is naturally hostile to class; that rich and poor are intended by nature to live at war with one another. So irrational and so false is this view, that the exact contrary is the truth. Just as the symmetry of the human body is the result of the disposition of the members of the body, so in a State it is ordained by nature that these two classes should exist in harmony and agreement, and should, as it were, fit into one another, so as to

⁵ Genesis iii, 17.

maintain the equilibrium of the body politic. Each requires the other; capital cannot do without labor, nor labor without capital. Mutual agreement results in pleasantness and good order; perpetual conflict necessarily produces confusion and outrage. Now, in preventing such strife as this, and in making it impossible, the efficacy of Christianity is marvelous and manifold. First of all, there is nothing more powerful than Religion (of which the Church is the interpreter and guardian) in drawing rich and poor together, by reminding each class of its duties to the other, and especially of the duties of justice. Thus Religion teaches the laboring man and the workman to carry out honestly and well all equitable agreements freely made, never to injure capital, nor to outrage the person of an employer; never to employ violence in representing his own cause, nor to engage in riot and disorder; and to have nothing to do with men of evil principles, who work upon the people with artful promises, and raise foolish hopes which usually end in disaster and in repentance when too late. Religion teaches the rich man and the employer that their work-people are not their slaves; that they must respect in every man his dignity as a man and as a Christian; that labor is nothing to be ashamed of, if we listen to right reason and to Christian philosophy, but is an honorable employment, enabling a man to sustain his life in an upright and creditable way; and that it is shameful and inhuman to treat men like chattels to make money by, or to look upon them merely as so much muscle or physical power. Thus, again, Religion teaches that, as among the workmen's concerns are Religion herself, and things spiritual and mental, the employer is bound to see that he has time for the duties of piety; that he be not exposed to corrupting influences and dangerous occasions; and that he be not led away to neglect his home and family or to squander his wages. Then, again, the employer must never tax his work-people beyond their strength, nor employ them in work unsuited to their sex or age. His great and principal obligation is to give to every one that which is just. Doubtless before we can decide whether wages are adequate many things have to be considered; but rich men and masters should remember this — that to exercise pres-

sure for the sake of gain, upon the indigent and destitute, and to make one's profit out of the need of another, is condemned by all laws, human and divine. To defraud any one of wages that are his due is a crime which cries to the avenging anger of Heaven. *Behold, the hire of the laborers . . . which by fraud has been kept back by you, crieth; and the cry of them hath entered the ears of the Lord of the Sabaoth.*⁶ Finally, the rich must religiously refrain from cutting down the workman's earnings, either by force, fraud, or by usurious dealing; and with the more reason because the poor man is weak and unprotected, and because his slender means should be sacred in proportion to their scantiness.

Were these precepts carefully obeyed and followed would not strife die out and cease?

But the Church, with Jesus Christ for its Master and Guide, aims higher still. It lays down precepts yet more perfect, and tries to bind class to class in friendliness and good understanding. The things of this earth cannot be understood or valued rightly without taking into consideration the life to come, the life that will last forever. Exclude the idea of futurity, and the very notion of what is good and right would perish; nay, the whole system of the universe would become a dark and unfathomable mystery. The great truth which we learn from Nature herself is also the grand Christian dogma on which religion rests as on its base — that when we have done with this present life then we shall really begin to live. God has not created us for the perishable and transitory things of earth, but for things heavenly and everlasting; He has given us this world as a place of exile, and not as our true country. Money and the other things which men call good and desirable — we may have them in abundance or we may want them altogether; as far as eternal happiness is concerned, it is no matter; the only thing that is important is to use them aright. Jesus Christ, when He redeemed us with *plentiful redemption*, took not away the pains and sorrows which in such large proportion make up the texture of our mortal life; He transformed them into motives of virtue and occasions of merit; and no man can hope

⁶ St. James v, 4.

for eternal reward unless he follow in the blood-stained footprints of his Saviour. *If we suffer with Him, we shall also reign with Him.*⁷ His labors and His sufferings, accepted by His own free will, have marvelously sweetened all suffering and all labor. And not only by His example, but by His grace and by the hope of everlasting recompense, He has made pain and grief more easy to endure; *for that which is at present momentary and light of our tribulation, worketh for us above measure exceedingly an eternal weight of glory.*⁸

CHRISTIANITY TEACHES PRACTICALLY THE RIGHT USE OF
MONEY

Therefore, those whom fortune favors are warned that freedom from sorrow and abundance of earthly riches are no guarantee of the beatitude that shall never end, but rather the contrary;⁹ that the rich should tremble at the threatenings of Jesus Christ—threatenings so strange in the mouth of our Lord,¹⁰ and that a most strict account must be given to the Supreme Judge for all that we possess. The chiefest and most excellent rule for the right use of money is one which the heathen philosophers indicated, but which the Church has traced out clearly, and has not only made known to men's minds, but has impressed upon their lives. It rests on the principle that it is one thing to have a right to the possession of money, and another to have a right to use money as one pleases. Private ownership, as we have seen, is the natural right of man; and to exercise that right, especially as members of society, is not only lawful but absolutely necessary. *It is lawful*, says St. Thomas of Aquin, *for a man to hold private property; and it is also necessary for the carrying on of human life.*¹¹ But if the question be asked, How must one's possessions be used? the Church replies without hesitation in the words of the same holy Doctor: *Man should not consider his outward possessions as his own, but as common to all, so as to share them without*

⁷ II Timothy ii, 12.

⁸ II Corinthians iv, 17.

⁹ St. Matthew xix, 23, 24.

¹⁰ St. Luke vi, 24, 25.

¹¹ 2a 2æ Q. lxxvi. Art. 2.

*difficulty when others are in need. Whence the Apostle saith, Command the rich of this world . . . to give with ease, to communicate.*¹² True, no one is commanded to distribute to others that which is required for his own necessities and those of his household; nor even to give away what is reasonably required to keep up becomingly his condition in life; *for no one ought to live unbecomingly.*¹³ But when necessity has been supplied, and one's position fairly considered, it is a duty to give to the indigent out of that which is over. *That which remaineth give alms.*¹⁴ It is a duty, not of justice (except in extreme cases), but of Christian charity — a duty which is not enforced by human law. But the laws and judgment of men must give place to the laws and judgment of Christ, the true God; Who in many ways urges on His followers the practice of almsgiving — *It is more blessed to give than to receive;*¹⁵ and Who will count a kindness done or refused to the poor as done or refused to Himself — *As long as you did it to one of My least brethren, you did it to Me.*¹⁶ Thus to sum up what has been said: — Whoever has received from the Divine bounty a large share of blessings, whether they be external and corporal, or gifts of the mind, has received them for the purpose of using them for perfecting his own nature, and, at the same time, that he may employ them, as the minister of God's Providence, for the benefit of others. *He that hath a talent,* says St. Gregory the Great, *let him see that he hideth not; he that hath abundance, let him arouse himself to mercy and generosity; he that hath art and skill, let him do his best to share the use and utility thereof with his neighbor.*¹⁷

THE DIGNITY OF LABOR

As for those who do not possess the gifts of fortune, they are taught by the Church that, in God's sight poverty is no disgrace, and that there is nothing to be ashamed of in seeking

¹² *Ibid.*, Q. lxxv, Art. 2.

¹³ 2a 2æ, Q. xxxii, Art. 6.

¹⁴ St. Luke xi, 41.

¹⁵ Acts xx, 35.

¹⁶ St. Matthew xxv, 40.

¹⁷ St. Gregory the Great, Hom. ix, *in Evangelii*, n. 7.

one's bread by labor. This is strengthened by what we see in Christ Himself. Who *whereas He was rich, for our sakes became poor*,¹⁸ and Who, being the Son of God, and God Himself chose to seem and to be considered the son of a carpenter — nay, did not disdain to spend a great part of His life as a carpenter Himself. *Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?*¹⁹ From the contemplation of this Divine example, it is easy to understand that the true dignity and excellence of man lies in his moral qualities, that is, in virtue; that virtue is the common inheritance of all, equally within the reach of high and low, rich and poor; and that virtue, and virtue alone, wherever found, will be followed by the rewards of everlasting happiness. Nay, God Himself seems to incline more to those who suffer evil; for Jesus Christ calls the poor blessed;²⁰ He lovingly invites those in labor and grief to come to Him for solace;²¹ and He displays the tenderest charity to the lowly and oppressed. These reflections cannot fail to keep down the pride of those who are well off, and to cheer the spirit of the afflicted; to incline the former to generosity, and the latter to tranquil resignation. Thus the separation which pride would make tends to disappear, nor will it be difficult to make rich and poor join hands in friendly concord.

But, if Christian precepts prevail, the two classes will not only be united in the bonds of friendship, but also in those of brotherly love. For they will understand and feel that all men are the children of the common father, that is, of God; that all have the same last end, which is God Himself, Who alone can make either men or angels absolutely perfectly happy; that all and each are redeemed by Jesus Christ, and raised to the dignity of children of God, and are thus united in brotherly ties both with each other and with Jesus Christ, *the first born among many brethren*; that the blessings of nature and the gifts of grace belong in common to the whole human race, and that to all, except to those who are unworthy, is promised the inheritance of

¹⁸ II Corinthians viii, 9.

¹⁹ St. Mark vi, 3.

²⁰ St. Matthew v, 3: "*Blessed are the poor in spirit.*"

²¹ *Ibid.*, xi, 28: "*Come to Me, all you that labor and are burdened, and I will refresh you.*"

the Kingdom of Heaven. *If sons, heirs also; heirs indeed of God, and co-heirs of Christ.*²²

Such is the scheme of duties and of rights which is put forth to the world by the Gospel. Would it not seem that strife must quickly cease were society penetrated with ideals like these?

SOCIAL EVILS TO BE REMEDIED ONLY BY RETURN TO
CHRISTIAN LIFE AND INSTITUTIONS

But the Church, not content with pointing out the remedy, also applies it. For the Church does its utmost to teach and to train men, and to educate them; and by means of its Bishops and clergy it diffuses its salutary teachings far and wide. It strives to influence the mind and heart so that all may willingly yield themselves to be formed and guided by the commandments of God. It is precisely in this fundamental and principal matter, on which everything depends, that the Church has a power peculiar to itself. The agencies which it employs are given it for the very purpose of reaching the hearts of men by Jesus Christ Himself, and derive their efficiency from God. They alone can touch the innermost heart and conscience, and bring men to act from a motive of duty, to resist their passions and appetites, to love God and their fellowmen with a love that is unique and supreme, and courageously to break down every barrier which stands in the way of a virtuous life.

On this subject We need only recall for one moment the examples written down in history. Of these things there cannot be the shadow of doubt; for instance, that civil society was renovated in every part by the teachings of Christianity; that in the strength of that renewal the human race was lifted up to better things — nay, that it was brought back from death to life, and to so excellent a life that nothing more perfect had been known before or will come to pass in the ages that are yet to be. Of this beneficent transformation, Jesus Christ was at once the first cause and the final purpose; as from Him all came, so to Him all was to be referred. For when, by the light of the Gospel message, the human race came to know the grand mystery of the Incarnation of the Word and the redemption

²² Romans viii, 17.

of man, the life of Jesus Christ, God and Man, penetrated every race and nation, and impregnated them with His faith, His precepts, and His laws. And, if Society is to be cured now, in no other way can it be cured but by a return to the Christian life and Christian institutions. When a society is perishing, the true advice to give to those who would restore it is, to recall it to the principles from which it sprung; for the purpose and perfection of an association is to aim at and to attain that for which it was formed; and its operation should be put in motion and inspired by the end and object which originally gave it its being. So that to fall away from its primal constitution is disease; to go back to it is recovery. And this may be asserted with the utmost truth both of the State in general and of that body of its citizens — by far the greater number — who sustain life by labor.

THE CHURCH SEEKS THE MATERIAL WELFARE OF THE POOR

Neither must it be supposed that the solicitude of the Church is so occupied with the spiritual concerns of its children as to neglect their interests temporal and earthly. Its desire is that the poor, for example, should rise above poverty and wretchedness, and should better their condition in life; and for this it strives. By the very fact that it calls men to virtue and forms them to its practice, it promotes this in no slight degree. Christian morality, when it is adequately and completely practiced, conduces of itself to temporal prosperity, for it merits the blessing of that God who is the source of all blessings; it powerfully restrains the lust of possession and the lust of pleasure — twin plagues, which too often make a man without self-restraint miserable in the midst of abundance;²³ it makes men supply by economy for the want of means, teaching them to be content with frugal living, and keeping them out of the reach of those vices which eat up not only merely small incomes, but large fortunes, and dissipate many a goodly inheritance.

Moreover, the Church intervenes directly in the interest of the poor, by setting on foot and keeping up many things which it sees to be efficacious in the relief of poverty. Here, again, it

²³ "The root of all evils is cupidity."— I Tim. vi, 10.

has always succeeded so well that it has even extorted the praise of its enemies. Such was the ardor of brotherly love among the earliest Christians that numbers of those who were better off deprived themselves of their possessions in order to relieve their brethren; whence *neither was there any one needy among them.*²⁴ To the order of Deacons, instituted for that very purpose, was committed by the Apostles the charge of the daily distributions; and the Apostle Paul, though burdened with the solicitude of all the churches, hesitated not to undertake laborious journeys in order to carry the alms of the faithful to the poorer Christians. Tertullian calls these contributions, given voluntarily by Christians in their assemblies, *deposits of piety*; because, to cite his words, they were employed *in feeding the needy, in burying them, in the support of boys and girls destitute of means and deprived of their parents, in the care of the aged, and in the relief of the shipwrecked.*²⁵

Thus by degrees came into existence the patrimony which the Church has guarded with jealous care as the inheritance of the poor. Nay, to spare them the shame of begging, the common Mother of the rich and poor has exerted herself to gather together funds for the support of the needy. The Church has stirred up everywhere the heroism of charity, and has established Congregations of Religious and many other useful institutions for help and mercy, so that there might be hardly any kind of suffering which was not visited and relieved. At the present day there are many who, like the heathen of old, blame and condemn the Church for this beautiful charity. They would substitute in its place a system of State-organized relief. But no human methods will ever supply for the devotion and self-sacrifice of Christian charity. Charity, as a virtue, belongs to the Church; for it is no virtue unless it is drawn from the Sacred Heart of Jesus Christ; and he who turns his back on the Church cannot be near to Christ.

THE STATE'S SHARE IN THE RELIEF OF POVERTY

It cannot, however, be doubted that to attain the purpose of which We treat, not only the Church, but all human means

²⁴ Acts iv, 34.

²⁵ *Apologia Secunda*, xxxix.

must conspire. All who are concerned in the matter must be of one mind and must act together. It is in this, as in the Providence which governs the world; results do not happen save where all the causes co-operate.

Let us now, therefore, inquire what part the State should play in the work of remedy and relief.

By the State We here understand, not the particular form of government which prevails in this or that nation, but the State as rightly understood; that is to say, any government conformable in its institutions to right reason and natural law, and to those dictates of the Divine wisdom which We have expounded in the Encyclical on the Christian Constitution of the State. The first duty, therefore, of the rulers of the State should be to make sure that the laws and institutions, the general character and administration of the commonwealth, shall be such as to produce of themselves public well-being and private prosperity. This is the proper office of wise statesmanship and the work of the heads of the State. Now a State chiefly prospers and flourishes by morality, by well-regulated family life, by respect for religion and justice, by the moderation and equal distribution of public burdens, by the progress of the arts and of trade, by the abundant yield of the land — by everything which makes the citizens better and happier. Here, then, it is in the power of a ruler to benefit every order of the State, and amongst the rest to promote in the highest degree the interests of the poor; and this by virtue of his office, and without being exposed to any suspicion of undue interference — for it is the province of the commonwealth to consult for the common good. And the more that is done for the working population by the general laws of the country, the less need will there be to seek for particular means to relieve them. There is another and a deeper consideration which must not be lost sight of.

TO THE STATE THE INTERESTS OF ALL ARE EQUAL

Whether high or low. The poor are members of the national community equally with the rich: they are real component parts, living parts, which make up, through the family, the living

body; and it need hardly be said that they are by far the majority. It would be irrational to neglect one portion of the citizens and to favor another; and therefore the public administration must duly and solicitously provide for the welfare and the comfort of the working people, or else that law of justice will be violated which ordains that each shall have his due. To cite the wise words of St. Thomas of Aquin: *As the part and the whole are in a certain sense identical, the part may in some sense claim what belongs to the whole.*²⁶ Among the many and grave duties of rulers who would do their best for the people, the first and chief is to act with strict justice — with that justice which is called in the Schools *distributive* — towards each and every class.

But although all citizens, without exception, can and ought to contribute to that common good in which individuals share so profitably to themselves, yet it is not to be supposed that all can contribute in the same way and to the same extent. No matter what changes may be made in forms of government, there will always be differences and inequalities of condition in the State; Society cannot exist or be conceived without them. Some there must be who dedicate themselves to the work of the commonwealth, who make the laws, who administer justice, whose advice and authority govern the nation in times of peace, and defend it in war. Such men clearly occupy the foremost place in the State, and should be held in the foremost estimation, for their work touches most nearly and effectively the general interests of the community. Those who labor at a trade or calling do not promote the general welfare in such a fashion as this; but they do in the most important way benefit the nation, though less directly. We have insisted that, since it is the end of Society to make men better, the chief good that Society can be possessed of is Virtue. Nevertheless, in all well-constituted States it is a by no means unimportant matter to provide those bodily and external commodities, *the use of which is necessary to virtuous action.*²⁷ And in the provision of material well-being, the labor of the poor — the exercise of

²⁶ 2a 2æ, Q. lxi, Art. 1 and 2.

²⁷ St. Thomas of Aquin. *De Regimine Principum*, I, cap. 15.

their skill and the employment of their strength in the culture of the land and the workshops of trade — is most efficacious and altogether indispensable. Indeed, their co-operation in this respect is so important that it may be truly said that

IT IS ONLY BY THE LABOR OF THE WORKING MAN THAT
STATES GROW RICH

Justice, therefore, demands that the interests of the poorer population be carefully watched over by the Administration, so that they who contribute so largely to the advantage of the community may themselves share in the benefits they create — that being housed, clothed, and enabled to support life, they may find their existence less hard and more endurable. It follows that whatever shall appear to be conducive to the well-being of those who work, should receive favorable consideration. Let it not be feared that solicitude of this kind will injure any interest; on the contrary, it will be to the advantage of all; for it cannot but be good for the commonwealth to secure from misery those on whom it so largely depends.

THE CHRISTIAN IDEA OF A STATE

We have said that the State must not absorb the individual or the family; both should be allowed free and untrammelled action as far as is consistent with the common good and the interests of others. Nevertheless, rulers should anxiously safeguard the community and all its parts; the community, because the conservation of the community is so emphatically the business of the supreme power, that the safety of the commonwealth is not only the first law, but it is a Government's whole reason of existence; and the parts, because both philosophy and the Gospel agree in laying down that the object of the administration of the State should be not the advantage of the ruler, but the benefit of those over whom he rules. The gift of authority is from God, and is, as it were, a participation of the highest of all sovereignties; and it should be exercised as the power of God is exercised — with a fatherly solicitude which not only guides the whole but reaches to details as well.

Whenever the general interest or any particular class suffers,

or is threatened with, evils which can in no other way be met, the public authority must step in to meet them. Now, among the interests of the public, as of private individuals, are these: that peace and good order should be maintained; that family life should be carried on in accordance with God's laws and those of nature; that Religion should be revered and obeyed; that a high standard of morality should prevail in public and private life; that the sanctity of justice should be respected, and that no one should injure another with impunity; that the members of the commonwealth should grow up to man's estate strong and robust, and capable, if need be, of guarding and defending their country. If by a strike, or other combination of workmen, there should be imminent danger of disturbance to the public peace; or if circumstances were such that among the laboring population the ties of family life were relaxed; if Religion were found to suffer through the workmen not having time and opportunity to practice it; if in workshops and factories there were danger to morals through the mixing of the sexes or from any occasion of evil; or if employers laid burdens upon the workmen which were unjust, or degraded them with conditions that were repugnant to their dignity as human beings; finally, if health were endangered by excessive labor, or by work unsuited to sex or age — in these cases there can be no question that, within certain limits, it would be right to call in the help and authority of the law. The limits must be determined by the nature of the occasion which calls for the law's interference — the principle being this, that the law must not undertake more, nor go further, than is required for the remedy of the evil or the removal of the danger.

SPECIAL CONSIDERATION DUE TO THE POOR

Rights must be religiously respected wherever they are found; and it is the duty of the public authority to prevent and punish injury, and to protect each one in the possession of his own.

Still, when there is question of protecting the rights of individuals, the poor and helpless have a claim to special consideration. The richer population have many ways of pro-

tecting themselves, and stand less in need of help from the State; those who are badly off have no resources of their own to fall back upon, and must chiefly rely upon the assistance of the State. And it is for this reason that wage-earners, who are, undoubtedly, among the weak and necessitous, should be specially cared for and protected by the commonwealth.

Here, however, it will be advisable to advert expressly to one or two of the more important details.

THE STATE SHOULD SAFEGUARD PRIVATE PROPERTY

It must be borne in mind that the chief thing to be secured is the safe-guarding, by legal enactment and policy, of private property. Most of all it is essential in these times of covetous greed, to keep the multitude within the line of duty; for if all may justly strive to better their condition, yet neither justice nor the common good allows anyone to seize that which belongs to another, or, under the pretext of futile and ridiculous equality, to lay hands on other people's fortunes. It is most true that by far the larger part of the people who work prefer to improve themselves by honest labor rather than by doing wrong to others. But there are not a few who are imbued with bad principles and are anxious for revolutionary change, and whose great purpose it is to stir up tumult and bring about a policy of violence. The authority of the State should intervene to put restraint upon these disturbers, to save the workmen from their seditious arts, and to protect lawful owners from spoliation.

THE STATE MUST PROTECT THE LABORERS' RIGHTS

When work-people have recourse to a strike, it is frequently because the hours of labor are too long, or the work too hard, or because they consider their wages insufficient. The grave inconvenience of this not uncommon occurrence should be obviated by public remedial measures; for such paralysis of labor not only affects the masters and their work-people, but is extremely injurious to trade, and to the general interests of the public; moreover, on such occasions, violence and disorder are generally not far off, and thus it frequently happens that

the public peace is threatened. The laws should be beforehand, and prevent these troubles from arising; they should lend their influence and authority to the removal in good time of the causes which lead to conflicts between masters and those whom they employ.

But if the owners of property must be made secure, the workman, too, has property and possessions in which he must be protected; and, first of all, there are his spiritual and mental interests. Life on earth, however good and desirable in itself, is not the final purpose for which man is created; it is only the way and the means to that attainment of truth, and that practice of goodness in which the full life of the soul consists. It is the soul which is made after the image and likeness of God; it is in the soul that sovereignty resides, in virtue of which man is commanded to rule the creatures below him, and to use all the earth and ocean for his profit and advantage. *Fill the earth and subdue it; and rule over the fishes of the sea and the fowls of the air, and all living creatures which move upon the earth.*²⁸ In this respect all men are equal; there is no difference between rich and poor, master and servant, ruler and ruled, *for the same is Lord over all.*²⁹ No man may outrage with impunity that human dignity which God Himself treats *with reverence*, nor stand in the way of that higher life which is the preparation for the eternal life of Heaven. Nay, more; a man has here no power over himself. To consent to any treatment which is calculated to defeat the end and purpose of his being is beyond his right; he cannot give up his soul to servitude; for it is not man's own rights which are here in question, but the rights of God, most sacred and inviolable.

From this follows the obligation of the cessation of work and labor on Sundays and certain festivals. This rest from labor is not to be understood as mere idleness; much less must it be an occasion of spending money and a vicious excess, as many would desire it to be; but it should be rest from labor consecrated by religion. Repose united with religious observance disposes man to forget for a while the business of this

²⁸ Genesis i, 28.

²⁹ Romans x, 12.

daily life, and to turn his thoughts to heavenly things and to the worship which he so strictly owes to the Eternal Deity. It is this, above all, which is the reason and motive of the Sunday rest; a rest sanctioned by God's great law of the ancient covenant, *Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath day*,³⁰ and taught to the world by His own mysterious "rest" after the creation of man; *He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had done*.³¹

SAVE THE LABORERS FROM THE CRUELTY OF SPECULATORS IN LABOR

If we turn now to things exterior and corporeal, the first concern of all is to save the poor workers from the cruelty of grasping speculators, who use human beings as mere instruments for making money. It is neither justice nor humanity so to grind men down with excessive labor as to stupefy their minds and wear out their bodies. Man's powers like his general nature, are limited, and beyond these limits he cannot go. His strength is devoted and increased by use and exercise, but only on condition of due intermission and proper rest. Daily labor, therefore, must be so regulated that it may not be protracted during longer hours than strength admits. How many and how long the intervals of rest should be, will depend upon the nature of the work, on circumstances of time and place, and on the health and strength of the workman. Those who labor in mines and quarries, and in work within the bowels of the earth, should have shorter hours in proportion, as their labor is more severe and more trying to health. Then, again, the season of the year must be taken into account; for not unfrequently a kind of labor is easy at one time which at another is intolerable or very difficult. Finally, work which is suitable for a strong man cannot reasonably be required from a woman or a child.

A WORD ON CHILD-LABOR

And, in regard to children, great care should be taken not to place them in workshops and factories until their bodies and

³⁰ Exodus xx, 8.

³¹ Genesis ii, 2, 3.

minds are sufficiently mature. For just as rough weather destroys the buds of spring, so too early an experience of life's hard work blights the young promise of a child's powers, and makes any real education impossible. Women, again, are not suited to certain trades; for a woman is by nature fitted for home-work, and it is that which is best adapted at once to preserve her modesty, and to promote the good bringing up of children and the well-being of the family. As a general principle, it may be laid down, that a workman ought to have leisure and rest in proportion to the wear and tear of his strength; for the waste of strength must be repaired by the cessation of work.

In all agreements between masters and work-people, there is always the condition, expressed or understood, that there be allowed proper rest for soul and body. To agree in any other sense would be against what is right and just; for it can never be right or just to require on the one side, or to promise on the other, the giving up of those duties which a man owes to his God and to himself.

EMPLOYERS' MORAL OBLIGATION TO PAY FAIR WAGES

We now approach a subject of very great importance and one on which, if extremes are to be avoided, right ideas are absolutely necessary. Wages, we are told, are fixed by free consent; and, therefore, the employer when he pays what was agreed upon, has done his part, and is not called upon for anything further. The only way, it is said, in which injustice could happen, would be if the master refused to pay the whole of the wages, or the workman would not complete the work undertaken; when this happens the State should intervene, to see that each obtains his own, but not in any other circumstances.

This mode of reasoning is by no means convincing to a fair-minded man; for there are important considerations which it leaves out of view altogether. To labor is to exert one's self for the sake of procuring what is necessary for the purposes of life, and most of all for self-preservation. *In the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat bread.*³² Therefore, a man's labor has two

³² Genesis iii, 1.

notes or characters. First of all, it is *personal*; for the exertion of individual power belongs to the individual who puts it forth, employing this power for that personal profit for which it was given. Secondly, man's labor is *necessary*; for without the results of labor a man cannot live; and self-conservation is a law of Nature, which it is wrong to disobey. Now, if we were to consider labor merely so far as it is *personal*, doubtless it would be within the workman's right to accept any rate of wages whatever; for in the same way as he is free to work or not, so he is free to accept a small remuneration or even none at all. But this is a mere abstract supposition; the labor of the working man is not only his personal attribute, but it is *necessary*; and this makes all the difference. The preservation of life is the bounden duty of each and all, and to fail therein is a crime. It follows that each one has a right to procure what is required in order to live; and the poor can procure it in no other way than by work and wages.

Let it be granted, then, that, as a rule, workman and employer should make free agreements, and in particular should freely agree as to wages; nevertheless, there is a dictate of nature more imperious and more ancient than any bargain between man and man, that the remuneration must be enough to support the wage-earner in reasonable and frugal comfort. If through necessity or fear of a worse evil, the workman accepts harder conditions because an employer or contractor will give him no better, he is the victim of force and injustice. In these and similar questions, however — such as, for example, the hours of labor in different trades, the sanitary precautions to be observed in factories and workshops, etc. — in order to supersede undue interference on the part of the State, especially as circumstances, times, and localities differ so widely, it is advisable that recourse be had to Societies or Boards such as We shall mention presently, or to some other method of safeguarding the interests of wage-earners; the State to be asked for approval and protection.

THE STATE SHOULD FAVOR MULTIPLICATION OF PROPERTY OWNERS

If a workman's wages be sufficient to enable him to maintain himself, his wife, and his children in reasonable comfort, he will not find it difficult, if he is a sensible man, to study economy; and he will not fail, by cutting down expenses, to put by a little property: nature and reason would urge him to do this. We have seen that this great Labor question cannot be solved except by assuming as a principle that private ownership must be held sacred and inviolable. The law, therefore, should favor ownership, and its policy should be to induce as many people as possible to become owners.

Many excellent results will follow from this; and first of all, property will certainly become more equitably divided. For the effect of civil change and revolution has been to divide society into two widely different castes. On the one side there is the party which holds the power because it holds the wealth; which has in its grasp all labor and trade; which manipulates for its own benefit and its own purposes all the sources of supply, and which is powerfully represented in the councils of the State itself. On the other side there is the needy and powerless multitude, sore and suffering, always ready for disturbance. If working people can be encouraged to look forward to obtaining a share in the land, the result will be that the gulf between vast wealth and deep poverty will be bridged over, and the two orders will be brought nearer together. Another consequence will be the greater abundance of the fruits of the earth. Men always work harder and more readily when they work on that which is their own; nay, they learn to love the very soil which yields in response to the labor of their hands, not only food to eat, but an abundance of the good things for themselves and those that are dear to them. It is evident how such a spirit of willing labor would add to the produce of the earth and to the wealth of the community. And a third advantage would arise from this: men would cling to the country in which they were born; for no one would exchange his country for a foreign land if his own afforded him the means of living a tolerable and happy life. These three important

benefits, however, can only be expected on the condition that a man's means be not drained and exhausted by excessive taxation. The right to possess private property is from nature, not from man; and the State has only the right to regulate its use in the interests of the public good, but by no means to abolish it altogether. The State is, therefore, unjust and cruel, if, in the name of taxation, it deprives the private owner of more than is just.

MULTIPLY WORKINGMEN'S ASSOCIATIONS

In the last place — employers and workmen may themselves effect much in the matter of which We treat, by means of those institutions and organizations which afford opportune assistance to those in need, and which draw the two orders more closely together. Among these may be enumerated: Societies for mutual help; various foundations established by private persons for providing for the workman, and for his widow or his orphans, in sudden calamity, in sickness, and in the event of death; and what are called "patronages," or institutions for the care of boys and girls, for young people, and also for those of more mature age.

The most important of all are Workmen's Associations; for these virtually include all the rest. History attests what excellent results were effected by the Artificers' Guilds of a former day. They were the means not only of many advantages to the workmen, but in no small degree of the advancement of art, as numerous monuments remain to prove. Such associations should be adapted to the requirements of the age in which we live — an age of greater instruction, of different customs, and of more numerous requirements in daily life. It is gratifying to know that there are actually in existence not a few Societies of this nature, consisting either of workmen alone, or of workmen and employers together; but it were greatly to be desired that they should multiply and become more effective. We have spoken of them more than once; but it will be well to explain here how much they are needed, to show that they exist by their own right, and to enter into their organization and their work.

The experience of his own weakness urges man to call in help from without. We read in the pages of Holy Writ: *It is better that two should be together than one; for they have the advantage of their society. If one fall he shall be supported by the other. Woe to him that is alone, for when he falleth he hath none to lift him up.*³³ And further: *A brother that is helped by his brother is like a strong city.*³⁴ It is this natural impulse which unites men in civil society; and it is this also which makes them band themselves together in associations of citizen with citizen; associations which, it is true, cannot be called societies in the complete sense of the word, but which are societies nevertheless.

These lesser societies and the society which constitutes the State differ in many things, because their immediate purpose and end is different. Civil society exists for the common good, and, therefore, is concerned with the interests of all in general, and with the individual interests in their due place and proportion. Hence, it is called *public* society, because by its means, as St. Thomas of Aquin says, *Men communicate with one another in the setting up of a commonwealth.*³⁵ But the societies which are formed in the bosom of the State are called *private*, and justly so, because their immediate purpose is the private advantage of the associates. *Now, a private society,* says St. Thomas again, *is one which is formed for the purpose of carrying out private business; as when two or three enter into partnership with the view of trading in conjunction.*³⁶ Particular societies, then, although they exist within the State, and are each a part of the State, nevertheless cannot be prohibited by the State absolutely and as such. For to enter into "society" of this kind is the natural right of man; and the State must protect natural rights, not destroy them; and if it forbids its citizens to form associations, it contradicts the very principle of its own existence; for both they and it exist in virtue of the same principle, viz., the natural propensity of man to live in society.

³³ Ecclesiastes iv, 9, 10.

³⁴ Proverbs xv, 3, 19.

³⁵ *Contra impugnantes Dei cultum et religionem*, cap. II.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

There are times, no doubt, when it is right that the law should interfere to prevent association; as when men join together for purposes which are evidently bad, unjust or dangerous to the State. In such cases the public authority may justly forbid the formation of associations, and may dissolve them when they already exist. But every precaution should be taken not to violate the rights of individuals, and not to make unreasonable regulations under the pretense of public benefit. For laws only bind when they are in accordance with right reason, and therefore with the eternal law of God.³⁷

THE ADVANTAGES OF LAWFUL COMBINATION

And here we are reminded of the Confraternities, Societies, and Religious Orders which have arisen by the Church's authority and the piety of the Christian people. The annals of every nation down to our own times testify to what they have done for the human race. It is indisputable on grounds of reason alone, that such associations, being perfectly blameless in their objects, have the sanction of the law of nature. On their religious side, they rightly claim to be responsible to the Church alone. The administrators of the State, therefore, have no rights over them, nor can they claim any share in their management; on the contrary, it is the State's duty to respect and cherish them, and, if necessary, to defend them from attack. It is notorious that a very different course has been followed, more especially in our own times. In many places the State has laid violent hands on these communities, and committed manifold injustice against them; it has placed them under the civil law, taken away their rights as corporate bodies, and robbed them of their property. In such property the Church had her rights, each member of the body had his or her rights, and there were also the rights of those who had founded or endowed them for a definite purpose, and of those for whose benefit and assistance they existed. Wherefore, We cannot re-

³⁷ *Human law is law only in virtue of its accordance with right reason: and thus it is manifest that it flows from the eternal law. And in so far as it deviates from right reason it is called an unjust law; in such case it is not law at all, but rather a species of violence.*—St. Thomas of Aquin, *Summa Theologica*, 1a 2æ, Q. xciii, Art. 3.

frain from complaining of such spoliation as unjust and fraught with evil results; and with the more reason because, at the very time when the law proclaims that association is free to all, We see that Catholic societies, however peaceable and useful, are hindered in every way, whilst the utmost freedom is given to men whose objects are at once hurtful to Religion and dangerous to the State.

Associations of every kind, and especially those of working men, are now far more common than formerly. In regard to many of these there is no need at present to inquire whence they spring, what are their objects or what means they use. But there is a good deal of evidence which goes to prove that many of these societies are in the hands of invisible leaders, and are managed on principles far from compatible with Christianity and the public well-being; and that they do their best to get into their hands the whole field of labor and to force workmen either to join them or to starve. Under these circumstances the Christian workmen must do one of two things: either join associations in which their religion will be exposed to peril, or form associations among themselves — unite their forces and courageously shake off the yoke of unjust and intolerable oppression. No one who does not wish to expose man's chief good to extreme danger will hesitate to say that the second alternative must by all means be adopted.

CATHOLIC BENEFIT AND INSURANCE SOCIETIES

Those Catholics are worthy of all praise — and there are not a few — who, understanding what the times require, have, by various enterprises and experiments, endeavored to better the condition of the working people without any sacrifice of principle. They have taken up the cause of the working man, and have striven to make both families and individuals better off; to infuse the spirit of justice into the mutual relations of employer and employed; to keep before the eyes of both classes the precepts of duty and the laws of the Gospel — that Gospel which, by inculcating self-restraint, keeps men within the bounds of moderation, and tends to establish harmony among the divergent interests and various classes which compose the

State. It is with such ends in view that We see men of eminence meeting together for discussion, for the promotion of united action, and for practical work. Others, again, strive to unite working people of various kinds into associations, help them with their advice and their means, and enable them to obtain honest and profitable work. The Bishops, on their part, bestow their ready good-will and support; and with their approval and guidance many members of the clergy, both secular and regular, labor assiduously on behalf of the spiritual and mental interests of the members of Associations. And there are not wanting Catholics possessed of affluence, who have, as it were, cast their lot with the wage-earners, and who have spent large sums in founding and widely spreading Benefit and Insurance Societies, by means of which the working man may without difficulty acquire by his labor not only many present advantages, but also the certainty of honorable support in time to come. How much this multiplied and earnest activity has benefited the community at large is too well known to require Us to dwell upon it. We find in it the grounds of the most cheering hope for the future; provided that the Associations We have described continue to grow and spread, and are well and wisely administered. Let the State watch over these Societies of citizens united together in the exercise of their right; but let it not thrust itself into their peculiar concerns and their organization, for things move and live by the soul within them, and they may be killed by the grasp of a hand from without.

In order that an Association may be carried on with a unity of purpose and harmony of action, its organization and government must be firm and wise. All such Societies, being free to exist, have the further right to adopt such rules and organization as may best conduce to the attainment of their objects. We do not deem it possible to enter into definite details on the subject of organization; this must depend on national character, on practice and experience, on the nature and scope of the work to be done, on the magnitude of the various trades and employments, and on other circumstances of fact and of time — all of which must be carefully weighed.

FOUND THE ORGANIZATIONS ON RELIGION

Speaking summarily, we may lay it down as a general and perpetual law, that Workmen's Associations should be so organized and governed as to furnish the best and most suitable means for attaining what is aimed at, that is to say, for helping each individual member to better his condition to the utmost, in body, mind and property. It is clear that they must pay special and principal attention to piety and morality, and that their internal discipline must be directed precisely by these considerations; otherwise they entirely lose their special character, and come to be very little better than those societies which take no account of religion at all. What advantage can it be to a Workman to obtain by means of a Society all that he requires, and to endanger his soul for want of spiritual food? *What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his own soul?*³⁸

This, as Our Lord teaches, is the note or character that distinguishes the Christian from the heathen. *After all these things do the heathens seek. . . . Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His justice, and all these things shall be added unto you.*³⁹ Let our Associations, then, look first and before all to God; let religious instruction have therein a foremost place, each one being carefully taught what is his duty to God, what to believe, what to hope for, and how to work out his salvation; and let all be warned and fortified with especial solicitude against wrong opinions and false teaching. Let the working man be urged and led to the worship of God, to the earnest practice of religion, and, among other things, to the sanctification of Sundays and festivals. Let him learn to reverence and love Holy Church, the common Mother of us all; and so to obey the precepts and frequent the Sacraments of the Church, those Sacraments being the means ordained by God for obtaining forgiveness of sin and for leading a holy life.

The foundations of the organization being laid in Religion, We next go on to determine the relations of the members, one to another, in order that they may live together in concord, and

³⁸ St. Matthew xvi, 26.

³⁹ St. Matthew vi, 32, 33.

go on prosperously and successfully. The offices and charges of the Society should be distributed for the good of the Society itself, and in such manner that difference in degree or position should not interfere with unanimity and good-will. Office-bearers should be appointed with prudence and discretion, and each one's charge should be carefully marked out; thus no member will suffer wrong. Let the common funds be administered with strictest honesty, in such way that a member receives assistance in proportion to his necessities. The rights and duties of employers should be the subject of careful consideration as compared with the rights and duties of the employed. If it should happen that either a master or a workman deemed himself injured, nothing would be more desirable than that there should be a committee composed of honest and capable men of the Association itself, whose duty it should be, by the laws of the Association, to decide the dispute. Among the purposes of a Society should be to try to arrange for a continuous supply of work at all times and seasons; and to create a fund from which the members may be helped in their necessities, not only in case of accident, but also in sickness, old age, and misfortune.

Such rules and regulations, if obeyed willingly by all, will sufficiently ensure the well-being of poor people; whilst such Mutual Associations among Catholics are certain to be productive, in no small degree, of prosperity to the State. It is not rash to conjecture the future from the past. Age gives way to age, but the events of one century are wonderfully like those of another; for they are directed by the Providence of God, Who overrules the course of history in accordance with His purposes in creating the race of man. We are told that it was cast as a reproach on the Christians of the early ages of the Church, that the greater number of them had to live by begging or by labor. Yet, destitute as they were of wealth and influence they ended by winning over to their side the favor of the rich and the good-will of the powerful. They showed themselves industrious, laborious and peaceful, men of justice, and, above all, men of brotherly love. In the presence of such a life and such an example, prejudice disappeared, the tongue of malevolence

was silenced, and the lying traditions of ancient superstition yielded little by little to Christian truth.

At this moment the condition of the working population is the question of the hour; and nothing can be of higher interest to all classes of the State than that it should be rightly and reasonably decided. But it will be easy for Christian working men to decide it aright if they form Associations, choose wise guides, and follow the same path which with so much advantage to themselves and the commonwealth was trod by their fathers before them. Prejudice, it is true, is mighty, and so is the love of money; but if the sense of what is just and right be not destroyed by depravity of heart, their fellow-citizens are sure to be won over to a kindly feeling towards men whom they see to be so industrious and so modest, who so unmistakably prefer honesty to lucre, and the sacredness of duty to all other considerations.

And another great advantage would result from the state of things we are describing; there would be so much more hope and possibility of recalling to a sense of their duty those working men who have either given up their faith altogether, or whose lives are at variance with its precepts. These men, in most cases, feel that they have been fooled by empty promises and deceived by false appearances. They cannot but perceive that their grasping employers too often treat them with the greatest inhumanity, and hardly care for them beyond the profit their labor brings; and if they belong to an Association, it is probably one in which there exists, in place of charity and love, that intestine strife which always accompanies unresigned and irreligious poverty. Broken in spirit and worn down in body, how many of them would gladly free themselves from this galling slavery! But human respect, or the dread of starvation, makes them afraid to take the step. To such as these, Catholic associations are of incalculable service, helping them out of their difficulties, inviting them to companionship, and receiving the repentant to a shelter in which they may securely trust.

We have now laid before you, Venerable Brethren, who are the persons, and what are the means, by which this most difficult question must be solved. Every one must put his hand to

the work which falls to his share, and that at once and immediately, lest the evil which is already so great may by delay become absolutely beyond remedy. Those who rule the State must use the law and the institutions of the country; masters and rich men must remember their duty; the poor, whose interests are at stake, must make every lawful and proper effort; since Religion alone, as We said at the beginning, can destroy the evil at its root, all men must be persuaded that the primary thing needful is to return to real Christianity, in the absence of which all the plans and devices of the wisest will be of little avail.

As far as regards the Church, its assistance will never be wanting, be the time or the occasion what it may; and it will intervene with greater effect in proportion as its liberty of action is the more unfettered; let this be carefully noted by those whose office it is to provide for the public welfare. Every minister of holy Religion must throw into the conflict all the energy of his mind, and all the strength of his endurance; with your authority, Venerable Brethren, and by your example, they must never cease to urge upon all men of every class, upon the high as well as the lowly, the Gospel doctrines of Christian life; by every means in their power they must strive for the good of the people; and above all they must earnestly cherish in themselves, and try to arouse in others, Charity, the mistress and queen of virtues. For the happy results we all long for must be chiefly brought about by the plenteous outpouring of Charity; of that true Christian Charity which is the fulfilling of the whole Gospel law, which is always ready to sacrifice itself for others' sake, and which is man's surest antidote against worldly pride and immoderate love of self; that Charity whose office is described and whose God-like features are drawn by the Apostle St. Paul in these words: *Charity is patient, is kind, . . . seeketh not her own, . . . suffereth all things, . . . endureth all things.*⁴⁰

On each of you, Venerable Brethren, and on your Clergy and people, as an earnest of God's mercy and a mark of our affec-

⁴⁰ I Corinthians xiii, 4-7.

tion, We lovingly in the Lord bestow the Apostolic Benediction.

Given at St. Peter's in Rome, the fifteenth day of May, 1891,
the fourteenth year of our Pontificate.

LEO XIII., Pope.

2. CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY

BY POPE LEO XIII

Apostolic Letter *Graves de Communi*, January 18, 1901

THE grave discussions on economic questions which for some time past have disturbed the peace of several countries of the world are growing in frequency and intensity to such a degree that the minds of thoughtful men are filled, and rightly so, with worry and alarm. These discussions take their rise in the bad philosophical and ethical teaching which is now widespread among the people. The changes also which the mechanical inventions of the age have introduced, the rapidity of communication between places, and the devices of every kind for diminishing labor and increasing gain, all add bitterness to the strife; and lastly matters have been brought to such a pass by the struggle between capital and labor, fomented as it is by professional agitators, that the countries where these disturbances most frequently occur, find themselves confronted with ruin and disaster.

At the very beginning of Our Pontificate, We clearly pointed out what the peril was which confronted society on this head, and We deemed it Our duty to warn Catholics in unmistakable language how great the error was which was lurking in the utterances of Socialism, and how great the danger was that threatened not only their temporal possessions, but also their morality and religion. That was the purpose of Our Encyclical *Quod Apostolici Muneris* which We published on the 28th of December in the year 1878; but as these dangers day by day threatened still greater disaster, both to individuals and the commonwealth, We strove with all the more energy to avert them. This was the object of Our Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* of May 15th, 1891, in which We dwelt at length on the rights and duties which both classes of society — those namely, who

control capital, and those who contribute labor — are bound in relation to each other; and at the same time We made it evident that the remedies which are most useful to protect the cause of religion, and to terminate the contest between the different classes of society, were to be found in the precepts of the Gospel.

THE WORK DONE AND THE QUESTION OF NAME

Nor, with God's grace, were Our hopes entirely frustrated. Even those who are not Catholics, moved by the power of truth, avowed that the Church must be credited with a watchful care over all classes of society, and especially those whom fortune had least favored. Catholics of course profited abundantly by these Letters, for they not only received encouragement and strength for the admirable enterprises in which they were engaged but also obtained the light which they desired, by the help of which they were able with greater safety and with more plentiful blessings to continue the efforts which they had been making in the matter of which We are now speaking. Hence it happened that the differences of opinion which prevailed among them were either removed or their acrimony diminished and the discussion laid aside. In the work which they had undertaken this was effected, viz.: that in their efforts for the elevation of the poorer classes, especially in those places where the trouble is greatest, many new enterprises were set on foot; those which were already established were increased and all reaped the blessing of a greater stability imparted to them. Some of these works were called Bureaus of the People, their object being to supply information. Rural savings banks had been established, and various associations, some for mutual aid, others of relief, were organized. There were working men's societies and other enterprises for work or beneficence. Thus under the auspices of the Church, united action of Catholics was secured as well as wise discrimination exercised in the distribution of help for the poor who are often as badly dealt with by chicanery and exploitation of their necessities, as they are oppressed by indigence and toil. These schemes of popular benevolence were, at first, distinguished by

no particular appellation. The name of Christian Socialism with its derivatives which was adopted by some, was very properly allowed to fall into disuse. Afterwards some asked to have it called The Popular Christian Movement. In the countries most concerned with this matter, there are some who are known as Social Christians. Elsewhere the movement is described as Christian Democracy, and its partisans Christian Democrats, in contradistinction to those who are designated as Socialists, and whose system is known as Social Democracy. Not much exception is taken to the former, i.e., Social Christians, but many excellent men find the term Christian Democracy objectionable. They hold it to be very ambiguous and for this reason open to two objections. It seems by implication to covertly favor popular government, and to disparage other methods of political administration. Secondly, it appears to belittle religion by restricting its scope to the care of the poor, as if the other sections of society were not of its concern. More than that, under the shadow of its name, there might easily lurk a design to attack all legitimate power either civil or sacred. Wherefore, since this discussion is now so widespread, so exaggerated and so bitter, the consciousness of duty warns Us to put a check on this controversy and to define what Catholics are to think on this matter. We also propose to describe how the movement may extend its scope and be made more useful to the commonwealth.

CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY VS. SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

What Social Democracy is and what Christian Democracy ought to be, assuredly no one can doubt. The first, with due consideration to the greater or less intemperance of its utterance, is carried to such an excess by many as to maintain that there is really nothing existing above the natural order of things, and that the acquirement and enjoyment of corporal and external goods constitute man's happiness. It aims at putting all government in the hands of the people, reducing all ranks to the same level, abolishing all distinction of class, and finally introducing community of goods. Hence, the right of ownership is to be abrogated, and whatever property a man

possesses, or whatever means of livelihood he has, is to be common to all.

As against this, Christian Democracy, by the fact that it is Christian, is built, and necessarily so, on the basic principles of divine faith, and provides for the betterment of the masses, with the ulterior object of availing itself of the occasion to fashion their minds for things which are everlasting. Hence, for Christian Democracy justice is sacred; it must maintain that the right of acquiring and possessing property cannot be impugned, and it must safeguard the various distinctions and degrees which are indispensable in every well-ordered commonwealth. Finally it must endeavor to preserve in every human society the form and the character which God ever impresses on it. It is clear, therefore, that there is nothing in common between Social and Christian Democracy. They differ from each other as much as the sect of Socialism differs from the profession of Christianity.

CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY NOT POLITICAL

Moreover it would be a crime to distort this name of Christian Democracy to politics, for although democracy, both in its philological and philosophical signification, implies popular government, yet in its present application it is so to be employed that, removing from it all political significance, it is to mean nothing else than a benevolent and Christian movement in behalf of the people. For the laws of nature and of the Gospel, which by right are superior to all human contingencies, are necessarily independent of all modifications of civil government, while at the same time they are in concord with everything that is not repugnant to morality and justice. They are, therefore, and they must remain absolutely free from political parties, and have nothing to do with the various changes of administration which may occur in a nation; so that Catholics may and ought to be citizens according to the constitution of any State, guided as they are by those laws which command them to love God above all things, and their neighbors as themselves. This has always been the discipline of the Church. The Roman Pontiffs acted upon this principle, whenever they dealt with

different countries, no matter what might be the character of their governments. Hence, the mind and the action of Catholics who are devoted to the amelioration of the working classes, can never be actuated with the purpose of favoring and introducing one government in place of another.

NOT A MERE CLASS MOVEMENT

In the same manner, from Christian Democracy We must remove another possible subject of reproach, namely: that while looking after the advantage of the working people they should act in such a manner as to forget the upper classes of society; for they also are of the greatest use in preserving and perfecting the commonwealth. As We have explained, the Christian law of charity will prevent Us from so doing. For it extends to all classes of society, and all should be treated as members of the same family, as children of the same heavenly Father, as redeemed by the same Saviour, and called to the same eternal heritage. Hence the doctrine of the Apostle who warns us that: "We are one body and one spirit called to the one hope in our vocation; one Lord, one Faith and one Baptism; one God and the Father of all who is above all, and through all, and in us all." Wherefore on account of the nature of the union which exists between the different classes of society and which Christian brotherhood makes still closer, it follows that no matter how great Our devotion may be in helping the people, We should all the more keep Our hold upon the upper classes, because association with them is proper and necessary, as We shall explain later on, for the happy issue of the work in which We are engaged.

NOT A MOVEMENT OF SEDITION

Let there be no question of fostering under this name of Christian Democracy any intention of diminishing the spirit of obedience, or of withdrawing people from their lawful rulers. Both the natural and the Christian law command us to revere those who, in their various grades are above us in the State, and to submit ourselves to their just commands. It is quite in keeping with our dignity as men and Christians to obey, not

only exteriorly but from the heart, as the Apostle expresses it, for conscience's sake, when he commands us to keep our soul subject to the higher powers. It is abhorrent to the profession of a Christian for any one to be unwilling to be subject and obedient to those who rule in the Church, and first of all to the bishops whom (without prejudice to the universal power of the Roman Pontiff) the Holy Ghost has placed to rule the Church of God which Christ has purchased by His blood.¹ He who thinks or acts otherwise is guilty of ignoring the grave precept of the Apostle who bids us to obey our rulers and to be subject to them, for they watch, having to give an account of our souls. Let the faithful everywhere implant these principles deep in their souls, and put them in practice in their daily life, and let the ministers of the Gospel meditate them profoundly, and incessantly labor not merely by exhortation but especially by example to make them enter into the souls of others.

We have recalled these matters which on other occasions We have made the subject of Our instructions, in the hope that all dissension about the name of Christian Democracy will cease and that all suspicion of any danger coming from what the name signifies will be put at rest. And with reason do We hope so; for neglecting the opinions of certain men, with regard to the power and the efficacy of this kind of Christian Democracy, which at times are exaggerated and are not free from error, let no one, however, condemn that zeal which, according to the natural and divine law, has this for its object, viz.: to make the condition of those who toil more tolerable; to enable them to obtain, little by little, those means by which they may provide for the future; to help them to practice in public and in private the duties which morality and religion inculcate; to aid them to feel that they are not animals but men, not heathens but Christians, and so to enable them to strive more zealously and more eagerly for the one thing which is necessary, viz.: that ultimate good for which we are all born into this world. This is the intention; this is the work of those who wish that the people should be animated by Christian sentiments

¹ Acts xx, 28.

and should be protected from the contamination of socialism which threatens them.

IMPORTANCE OF RELIGION AND MORALITY

We have designedly made mention here of virtue and religion. For, it is the opinion of some, and the error is already very common, that the social question is merely an economic one, whereas in point of fact, it is above all a moral and religious matter, and for that reason must be settled by the principles of morality and according to the dictates of religion. For even though wages are doubled and the hours of labor are shortened and food is cheapened, yet if the working man hearkens to the doctrines that are taught on this subject, as he is prone to do, and is prompted by the example set before him to throw off respect for God and to enter upon a life of immorality, his labors and his gain will avail him naught.

Trial and experience have made it abundantly clear that many a workman lives in cramped and miserable quarters, in spite of his shorter hours and larger wages, simply because he has cast aside the restraints of morality and religion. Take away the instinct which Christian virtue has planted and nurtured in men's hearts, take away prudence, temperance, frugality, patience, and other correct, natural habits, no matter how much he may strive, he will never achieve prosperity. That is the reason why We have incessantly exhorted Catholics to enter these associations for bettering the condition of the laboring classes, and to organize other undertakings with the same object in view; but We have likewise warned them that all this should be done under the auspices of religion, with its help and under its guidance.

THE LAW OF CHARITY

The zeal of Catholics on behalf of the masses is especially noteworthy by the fact that it is engaged in the very field in which, under the benign inspiration of the Church, the active industry of charity has always labored, adapting itself in all classes to the varying exigencies of the times. For the law of mutual charity perfects, as it were, the law of justice, not

merely by giving each man his due and in not impeding him in the exercise of his rights, but also by befriending him in case of need, "not with the word alone, or the lips, but in deed and in truth"; being mindful of what Christ so lovingly said to His own: "A new commandment I give unto you, that you love one another as I have loved you, that you love also one another. By this shall all men know that you are My disciples, if you have love one for the other." This zeal in coming to the rescue of Our fellow men should, of course, be solicitous, first for the imperishable good of the soul, but it must not neglect what is necessary and helpful for the body.

We should remember what Christ said to the disciples of the Baptist who asked him: "Art Thou He that art to come or look we for another?" He invoked as the proof of the mission given to Him among men, His exercise of charity, quoting for them the text of Isaias: "The blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead rise again, the poor have the Gospel preached to them."² And speaking also of the Last Judgment and of the rewards and punishments He will assign, He declared that He would take special account of the charity men exercised towards each other. And in that discourse there is one thing that especially excites our surprise, viz.: that Christ omits those works of mercy which comfort the soul and refers only to external works which, although done in behalf of men, He regards as being done to Himself. "For I was hungry and you gave Me to eat; I was thirsty and you gave Me to drink; I was a stranger and you took Me in; naked and you covered Me; sick and you visited Me; I was in prison and you came to me."³

To the teachings which enjoin the twofold charity of spiritual and corporal works, Christ adds His own example so that no one may fail to recognize the importance which He attaches to it. In the present instance we recall the sweet words that came from His parental heart: I have pity on the multitude,⁴ as well as the desire He had to assist them even if it were necessary to invoke His miraculous power. Of His tender compassion we

² Matt. xi, 5.

³ Matt. xxv, 35.

⁴ Mark vii, 2.

have the proclamation made in Holy Writ, viz.: that He went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil.⁵ This law of charity which He imposed upon His apostles, they in the most holy and zealous way put into practice; and after them those who embraced Christianity originated that wonderful variety of institutions for alleviating all the miseries by which mankind is afflicted. And these institutions carried on and continually increased their powers of relief and were the especial glories of Christianity and of the civilization of which it was the source, so that right-minded men never fail to admire those foundations, aware as they are of the proneness of men to concern themselves about their own and neglect the needs of others.

Nor are we to eliminate from the list of good works the giving of money for charity, in pursuance of what Christ has said: "But yet that which remaineth, give alms."⁶ Against this, the Socialist cries out and demands its abolition as injurious to the native dignity of men. But if it is done in the manner which the Scripture enjoins,⁷ and in conformity with the true Christian spirit, it neither connotes pride in the giver nor inflicts shame upon the one who receives. Far from being dishonorable for man, it draws closer the bonds of human society by augmenting the force of the obligation of the duties which men are under with regard to each other. No one is so rich that he does not need another's help; no one so poor as not to be useful in some way to his fellow man; and the disposition to ask assistance from others with confidence, and to grant it with kindness is part of our very nature. Thus justice and charity are so linked with each other, under the equal and sweet law of Christ, as to form an admirable cohesive power in human society and to lead all of its members to exercise a sort of providence in looking after their own and in seeking the common good as well.

⁵ Acts x, 38.

⁶ Luke xi, 41.

⁷ Matt. vi, 2.

BENEVOLENT INSTITUTIONS

As regards not merely the temporary aid given to the laboring classes, but the establishment of permanent institutions in their behalf, it is most commendable for charity to undertake them. It will thus see that more certain and more reliable means of assistance will be afforded to the necessitous. That kind of help is especially worthy of recognition which forms the minds of mechanics and laborers to thrift and foresight so that in course of time they may be able, in part at least, to look out for themselves. To aim at that is not only to dignify the duty of the rich towards the poor, but to elevate the poor themselves; for while it urges them to work for a better degree of comfort in their manner of living, it preserves them meantime from danger by checking extravagance in their desires, and acts as a spur in the practice of the virtues proper to their state. Since, therefore, this is of such great avail and so much in keeping with the spirit of the times, it is a worthy object for charity to undertake with all prudence and zeal.

Let it be understood, therefore, that this devotion of Catholics to comfort and elevate the mass of the people is in keeping with the spirit of the Church and is most conformable to the examples which the Church has always held up for imitation. It matters very little whether it goes under the name of "The Popular Christian Movement," or "Christian Democracy," if the instructions that have been given by Us be fully carried out with the submission that is due. But it is of the greatest importance that Catholics should be one in mind, will, and action in a matter of such great moment. And it is also of importance that the influence of these undertakings should be extended by the multiplication of men and means devoted to the same object.

COOPERATION OF SOCIALLY POWERFUL

Especially must there be appeals to the kindly assistance of those whose rank, worldly wealth, and culture give them importance in the community. If their help is excluded, scarcely anything can be done which will be of any assistance for the wants which now clamor for satisfaction in this matter of the

well-being of the people. Assuredly the more earnestly many of those who are prominent in the State conspire effectively to attain that object the quicker and surer will the end be reached. We wish them to understand that they are not at all free to look after or neglect those who happen to be beneath them, but that it is a strict duty which binds them. For no one lives only for his personal advantage in a community; he lives for the common good as well, so that when others cannot contribute their share for the general object, those who can do so are obliged to make up the deficiency. The very extent of the benefits they have received increases the burden of their responsibility, and a stricter account will have to be rendered to God who bestowed those blessings upon them. What should also urge all to the fulfilment of their duty in this regard is the widespread disaster which will eventually fall upon all classes of society if this assistance does not arrive in time; and therefore is it that he who neglects the cause of the distressed poor is not doing his duty to himself or to the State.

If this social movement extends its scope far and wide in a true Christian fashion, and grows in its proper and genuine spirit, there will be no danger, as is feared, that those other institutions which the piety of our ancestors have established and which are now flourishing, will decline or be absorbed by new foundations. Both of them spring from the same root of charity and religion, and not only do not conflict with each other, but can be made to coalesce and combine so perfectly as to provide by a union of their benevolent resources in a more efficacious manner against the graver perils and necessities of the people which confront us to-day.

DANGER OF REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENTS

The condition of things at present proclaims, and proclaims vehemently, that there is need for a union of brave minds with all the resources they can command. The harvest of misery is before Our eyes, and the dreadful projects of the most disastrous national upheavals are threatening Us from the growing power of the socialistic movement. They have insidiously worked their way into the very heart of the State, and in the

darkness of their secret gatherings, and in the open light of day, in their writings and their harangues, they are urging the masses onward to sedition; they fling aside religious discipline, they scorn duties and clamor only for rights; they are working incessantly on the multitudes of the needy which daily grow greater, and which, because of their poverty, are easily deluded and hurried off into ways that are evil. It is equally the concern of the State and of religion, and all good men should deem it a sacred duty to preserve and guard both in the honor which is their due.

That this most desirable agreement of wills should be maintained, it is essential that all refrain from giving any causes of dissension in hurting and alienating the minds of others. Hence in newspapers and in speeches to the people, let them avoid subtle and useless questions which are neither easy to solve nor to understand except by minds of unusual ability and only after the most serious study. It is quite natural for people to think differently in doubtful questions, but those who address themselves to these subjects in a proper spirit will preserve their mental calm and not forget the respect which is due to those who differ from them. If minds see things in another light it is not necessary to become alienated forthwith. To whatever opinion a man's judgment may incline, if the matter is yet open to discussion let him keep it, provided his mental attitude is such that he is ready to yield if the Holy See should otherwise decide.

NECESSITY FOR UNITED ACTION

This Catholic action, of whatever description it may be, will work with greater effect if all of the various associations, while preserving their individual rights, move together under one primary and directive force.

In Italy We desire that this directive force should emanate from the Catholic Congresses and Reunions so often praised by Us, to further which Our predecessor and We Ourselves have ordered that these meetings should be controlled and guided by the bishops of the country. So let it be for other nations, in

case there be any leading organization of this description to which this matter has been legitimately entrusted.

Now in all questions of this sort where the interests of the Church and the Christian people are so closely allied, it is evident what they who are in the sacred ministry should do, and it is clear how industrious they should be in inculcating right doctrine and in teaching the duties of prudence and charity. To go out and move among the people, to exert a healthy influence on them by adapting themselves to the present condition of things is what more than once in addressing the clergy We have advised. More frequently also in writing to the bishops and other dignitaries of the Church, and especially of late (to the Minister General of the Minorites, November 25, 1898) We have lauded this affectionate solicitude for the people and declared it to be the especial duty of both the secular and regular clergy. But in the fulfilment of this obligation let there be the greatest caution and prudence exerted, and let it be done after the fashion of the saints. Francis, who was poor and humble, Vincent of Paul, the Father of the afflicted classes, and very many others whom the Church keeps ever in her memory, were wont to lavish their care upon the people, but in such wise as not to be engrossed overmuch or to be unmindful of themselves, or to let it prevent them from laboring with the same assiduity in the perfection of their own soul and the cultivation of virtue.

PRACTICAL PRINCIPLES

There remains one thing upon which We desire to insist very strongly, in which not only the ministers of the Gospel, but also all those who are devoting themselves to the cause of the people, can with very little difficulty bring about a most commendable result. That is to inculcate in the minds of the people, in a brotherly way and whenever the opportunity presents itself, the following principles, viz.: to keep aloof on all occasions from seditious acts and seditious men; to guard inviolate the rights of others; to show a proper respect to superiors; to willingly perform the work in which they are em-

ployed; not to grow weary of the restraint of family life which in many ways is so advantageous; to keep their religious practices above all, and in their hardships and trials to have recourse to the Church for consolation. In the furtherance of all this, it is very efficacious to propose the splendid example of the Holy Family of Nazareth, and to advise the invocation of its protection, and it also helps to remind the people of the examples of sanctity which have shone in the midst of poverty, and to hold up before them the reward that awaits them in the better life to come.

UNDER THE CONTROL OF THE BISHOPS

Finally, We recur again to what We have already declared and We insist upon it most solemnly, viz.: that whatever projects individuals or associations form in this matter should be done with due regard to Episcopal authority and absolutely under Episcopal guidance. Let them not be led astray by an excessive zeal in the cause of charity. If it leads them to be wanting in proper submission it is not a sincere zeal; it will not have useful result and cannot be acceptable to God. God delights in the souls of those who put aside their own designs and obey the rulers of His Church as if they were obeying Him; He assists them even when they attempt difficult things and benignly leads them to their desired end. Let them show also examples of virtue, so as to prove that a Christian is a hater of idleness and indulgence, that he gives willingly from his goods for the help of others, and that he stands firm and unconquered in the midst of adversity. Examples of that kind have a power of moving people to dispositions of soul that make for salvation, and have all the greater force as the condition of those who give them is higher in the social scale.

We exhort you, Venerable Brethren, to provide for all this, as the necessities of men and of places may require, according to your prudence and your zeal, meeting as usual in council to combine with each other in your plans for the furtherance of these projects. Let your solicitude watch and let your authority be effective in controlling, compelling, and also in preventing; lest any one under the pretext of good should

cause the vigor of sacred discipline to be relaxed or the order which Christ has established in His Church to be disturbed. Thus by the correct, concurrent, and ever-increasing labor of all Catholics, the truth will flash out more brilliantly than ever, viz.: that truth and true prosperity flourish especially among those peoples whom the Church controls and influences; and that she holds it as her sacred duty to admonish every one of what the law of God enjoins to unite the rich and the poor in the bonds of fraternal charity, and to lift up and strengthen men's souls in the times when adversity presses heavily upon them.

Let Our commands and Our wishes be confirmed by the words which are so full of apostolic charity which the blessed Paul addressed to the Romans: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, be reformed in the newness of your mind; he that giveth, with simplicity; he that ruleth, with carefulness; he that sheweth mercy with cheerfulness. Let love be without dissimulation — hating that which is evil; clinging to that which is good; loving one another with the charity of brotherhood; with honor preventing one another; in carefulness, not slothful; rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation; instant in prayer. Communicating to the necessities of the saints. Pursuing hospitality. Rejoice with them that rejoice; weep with them that weep; being of one mind to one another; to no man rendering evil for evil; providing good things not only in the sight of God but also in the sight of men."

As a pledge of these benefits receive the Apostolic Benediction which, Venerable Brethren, We grant most lovingly in the Lord to you and your clergy and people.

3. APOSTOLIC LETTER OF POPE PIUS X TO THE BISHOPS OF ITALY ON CATHOLIC SOCIAL ACTION ¹

A. INTRODUCTION

1. *Social Work Deserves High Praise*

IN our first encyclical to the Bishops of the world, in which we echoed all that our glorious predecessors had laid down concerning the Catholic action of the laity, we declared that this action was deserving of the highest praise, and was indeed necessary in the present condition of the Church and of society. And we cannot but praise warmly the zeal shown by so many illustrious personages who have for a long time dedicated themselves to this glorious task, and the ardor so many brilliant young people who have eagerly hastened to lend their aid to the same. The nineteenth Catholic Congress lately held at Bologna, and by us promoted and encouraged, has sufficiently proved to all the vigor of the Catholic forces as well as what useful and salutary results may be obtained among the faithful people, when this action is well governed and disciplined, and when unity of thought, sentiment, and action prevail among those who take part in it.

2. *Unity and Harmony are Necessary in Social Work*

But we are very sorry to find that certain differences which arose in the midst of them, have produced discussions unfortunately too vivacious, which, if not stopped in time, might serve to divide those forces of which we have spoken, and render them less efficacious. Before the Congress we recommended above all things unity and harmony, in order that it might

¹The greater part of this document is drawn from the two immediately preceding. It is included here because it shows that the social teaching of Leo was explicitly confirmed by Pius, and because it presents a convenient summary of the most important principles contained in that teaching.

be possible to lay down by common accord the general lines for the practical working of the Catholic movement; we cannot therefore be silent now. And since divergences of view in matters of practice have commonly their origin in the domain of theory, and indeed, find their support in the latter, it is necessary to define clearly the principles on which the entire Catholic movement must be based.

3. *Rules Given by Leo*

Our illustrious predecessor, Leo XIII, of holy memory, traced out luminously the rules that must be followed in the Christian movement among the people in the great encyclicals *Quod Apostolici Muneris*, of December 28, 1873; *Rerum Novarum*, of May 15, 1891, and *Graves de Communi*, of January 18, 1901; and further in a particular Instruction emanating from the Sacred Congregation for Extraordinary Affairs, of January 27, 1902.

4. *Strict Obligation to Observe These Rules*

And we, realizing, as did our predecessor, the great need that the Christian movement among the people be rightly governed and conducted, desire to have those most prudent rules exactly and completely fulfilled, and to provide that nobody may dare depart from them in the smallest particular. Hence, to keep them more vividly present before people's minds, we have deemed it well to summarize them from those same documents in the following articles, which will constitute the fundamental plan of the Catholic popular movement, and must form the constant rule of their conduct for all Catholics.

B. THE NINETEEN RULES

1. *Fundamental Truths*

HUMAN SOCIETY

1) Human society, as established by God, is composed of unequal elements, just as the different parts of the human body are unequal; to make them all equal is impossible, and would mean the destruction of human society itself. (Encyclical, *Quod Apostolici Muneris*.)

PERSONAL EQUALITY

2) The equality existing among the various social members consists only in this: that all men have their origin in God the Creator, have been redeemed by Jesus Christ, and are to be judged and rewarded or punished by God exactly according to their merits or demerits. (Encyclical, *Quod Apostolici Muneris*.)

SOCIAL INEQUALITY

3) Hence it follows that there are in human society, according to the ordinance of God, princes and subjects, masters and proletarians, rich and poor, learned and ignorant, nobles and plebeians, all of whom, united in the bonds of love, are to help one another to attain their last end in Heaven, and their material and moral welfare here on earth. (Encyclical, *Quod Apostolici Muneris*.)

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP

4) Of the goods of the earth man has not merely the use, like the brutes, but he has also the right of permanent proprietorship; and not merely of those things which are consumed by use, but also of those not consumed by use. (Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*.)

5) The right of private property, the fruit of labor or industry, or of concession or donation by others, is an incontrovertible natural right; and everybody can dispose reasonably of such property as he thinks fit. (Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*.)

JUSTICE AND CHARITY

6) To heal the breach between the rich and the poor, it is necessary to distinguish between justice and charity. There can be no claim for redress except when justice is violated. (Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*.)

2. Obligations of Justice

DUTIES OF EMPLOYEES

7) The following are obligations of justice binding on the proletarian and on the workingman: to perform fully and faith-

fully the work which has been freely and, according to equity, agreed upon; not to injure the property or outrage the person of masters; even in the defense of their own rights to abstain from acts of violence, and never to make mutiny of their defense. (Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*.)

DUTIES OF EMPLOYERS

8) The following are obligations of justice binding on capitalists and masters: To pay just wages to their workingmen; not to injure their just savings by violence or fraud, or by overt or covert usuries; to give them liberty to fulfill their religious duties; not to expose them to corrupting seductions and danger of scandal; not to alienate them from the spirit of family life and from love of economy; not to impose on them labor beyond their strength, or unsuitable for their age or sex. (Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*.)

3. *Obligations of Charity*

THE RICH

9) It is an obligation for the rich and those who own property to succor the poor and the indigent, according to the precepts of the Gospel. This obligation is so grave that on the Day of Judgment special account will be demanded by its fulfillment, as Christ Himself has said. (Matthew xxv., 14-46.) (Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*.)

THE POOR

10) The poor should not be ashamed of their poverty, nor disdain the charity of the rich; for they should have especially in view Jesus the Redeemer, who, though He might have been born in riches, made Himself poor in order that He might ennoble poverty and enrich it with incomparable merits for Heaven. (Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*.)

4. *Christian Democracy*

SOCIAL AIDS SOUGHT BY CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY

11) For the solution of the social question much can be done by the capitalists and the workmen themselves through

means of institutions designed to provide timely aid for the needy and to bring together and unite mutually the two classes. Among these institutions are mutual aid societies, various kinds of private insurance societies, unions for the protection of youth, and, above all, associations among the different trades and professions. (Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*.)

CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY BUILT ON CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE

12) This end is especially aimed at by the Christian Popular Movement or Christian Democracy in its many and varied branches. But Christian Democracy must be taken in the sense already authoritatively defined. Totally different from that of Social Democracy, it has for its basis the principles of Catholic faith and morals, especially the principle of not injuring in any way the inviolable right of private property. (Encyclical, *Graves de Communi*.)

CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY TO AVOID POLITICS

13) Moreover, Christian Democracy must have nothing to do with politics, and never serve political ends or parties; this is not its field; but it must be a beneficent movement for the good of the people, founded on the law of nature and the precepts of the Gospel. (Encyclical, *Graves de Communi* and Instruction of the S. Cong. for E.E. Affairs.)

Christian Democrats in Italy must abstain from participating in any political action whatsoever which is under present circumstances forbidden to every Catholic for reasons of the highest order. (Instruction of the S. Cong. for E.E. Affairs.)

CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY TO DEPEND ON ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY

14) In performing its functions, Christian Democracy is most strictly bound to depend upon Ecclesiastical Authority, and to render full submission and obedience to the Bishops and those who represent them. There is no meritorious zeal or sincere piety in enterprises, however beautiful and good in themselves, when they are not approved by the legitimate pastor. (Encyclical, *Graves de Communi*.)

CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY IN ITALY

15) In order that the Christian Democratic movement in Italy may be united in its efforts, it must be under the direction of the Association of Catholic Congresses and Committees, which, during many years of praiseworthy labor, has deserved so well of Holy Church, and to which Pius IX, and Leo XIII, of holy memory, have entrusted the charge of directing the whole Catholic movement, always, of course, under the auspices and guidance of the Bishops. (Encyclical, *Graves de Communi.*)

5. *Duties of Catholic Social Writers*

SUBJECTION TO THE HOLY SEE

16) Catholic writers must, in all that touches religious interests and the action of the Church in society, subject themselves entirely in intellect and will, like all the other faithful Catholics, to their bishops and to the Roman Pontiff. They must, above all, take care not to anticipate the judgments of the Holy See in any important matter. (Instruction of the Cong. for E.E. Affairs.)

ECCLESIASTICAL PERMISSION FOR THEIR PUBLICATIONS

17) Christian Democratic writers must, like all other Catholic writers, submit to the previous examination of the Ordinary all writings which concern religion, Christian morals, and natural ethics, by virtue of the Constitution *Officiorum et Munerum* (Art. 41). By the same Constitution ecclesiastics must obtain the previous consent of the Ordinary even for the publication of writings of a merely technical character. (Instruction of the Cong. for E.E. Affairs.)

CHARITY AND HARMONY AMONG THEMSELVES AND OBEDIENCE
TO ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY

18) They must, moreover, make every effort and every sacrifice to ensure that charity and harmony may reign among them, avoiding every kind of injurious and censorious language. When causes of disagreement arise, they should, instead of printing anything on the matter in the papers, refer it to the

ecclesiastical authority, which will then act with justice. When taken to task by the ecclesiastical authority, let them obey promptly without evasion or public complaints, the right of appeal to a higher authority being understood when the case requires it and when made in the right way. (Instruction of the Cong. for E.E. Affairs.)

19) Finally, let Catholic writers take care, when defending the cause of the proletariat and the poor, not to use language calculated to inspire among the people aversion to the upper classes of society. Let them refrain from speaking of redress and justice when the matter comes within the domain of charity only, as has been explained above. Let them remember that Jesus Christ endeavored to unite all men in the bond of mutual love, which is the perfection of justice, and which carries with it the obligation of working for the welfare of one another. (Instruction of the Cong. for E.E. Affairs.)

C. CONCLUSION

1. *All Social Workers Ought to Know and Observe These Rules*

The foregoing fundamental rules we of our own initiative and with certain knowledge do renew by our apostolic authority in all their parts, and we ordain that they be transmitted to all Catholic Committees, Societies, and Unions of whatever kind and form. All these societies are to keep them exposed in their rooms and to have them read frequently at their meetings. We ordain, moreover, that the Catholic papers publish them in their entirety, declare their own observance of them religiously; failing to do this they are to be gravely admonished and if they do not then amend, let them be interdicted by ecclesiastical authority.

2. *Social Workers Must Lead an Exemplary Life*

But as words and energetic action are of no avail unless preceded, accompanied and followed constantly by example, the necessary characteristic which should shine forth in all the members of every Catholic association, is that of openly manifesting their faith by the holiness of their lives, by the spotless-

ness of their morals, and by the scrupulous observance of the laws of God and of the Church. And this because it is the duty of every Christian, and also in order "that he who is on the contrary part, may be afraid, having no evil to say of us." (Tit. 11: 8.)

3. *God's Blessing on the Work*

From this solicitude of ours for the common good of Catholic action, especially in Italy, we hope, through the blessing of God, to reap abundant and happy fruits.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, on December 18, 1903, in the first year of our Pontificate.

PIUS X., Pope.

4. EXTRACTS FROM LETTER OF POPE PIUS X CONDEMNING *LE SILLON*¹

THE SILLON AND CATHOLICISM

AND now, penetrated with the keenest sorrow, we ask you, Venerable Brethren, what has become of the Catholicism of the *Sillon*? Alas! that which once held out such fair hopes, this clear rushing stream has been captured in its course by the modern enemies of the Church, and only forms a miserable tributary of the great movement of apostasy, organised in every country, for the establishment of a universal Church, which shall have neither dogmas nor hierarchy, neither rule for the mind nor bit for the passions; which, under the pretexts of liberty and human dignity, and if it could have its way, would bring into the world the legal reign of deceit and might, and oppression of the weak and of those who suffer and toil.

We know but too many dark laboratories where these noxious doctrines, which should deceive no clear-minded man, are con-

¹ This document was issued August 25, 1910. *Le Sillon* ("The Furrow") was an organization of French Catholics, founded by M. Marc Sangier, to improve the condition of the working classes in response to the call of Pope Leo XIII. Within a few years it became exceedingly powerful, but the zeal and enthusiasm of its leaders were not tempered by that moderation, sound doctrine and religious loyalty which are essential in a movement truly Catholic. Despite the counsel and admonitions of the French Bishops, *Le Sillon* continued to exhibit dangerous tendencies and to preach dangerous doctrines. At length it was condemned by Pope Pius X, as disloyal to ecclesiastical authority, as propagating social doctrines contrary to those laid down by Pope Leo XIII, and as attempting to commit the Church to the support of democratic forms of government exclusively. Inasmuch as these errors were, upon the publication of the Pope's Letter, promptly renounced by M. Sangier and the other leaders of *Le Sillon*, and inasmuch as the errors never obtained a serious foothold in Catholic social movements outside of France, the greater part of the Letter has been omitted from this volume. The two sections that have been included are pertinent to-day, and have a universal and permanent application to social movements and conditions.

cocted. The leaders of the *Sillon* are unable to defend themselves against them: the exaltation of their sentiments, the blind goodness of their hearts, their philosophical mysticism mingled with illuminism, have dragged them towards a new gospel, in which they think they see the true Gospel of the Saviour, so much so, that they dare to treat Our Lord Jesus Christ with the most disrespectful familiarity; and their ideal being the offspring of the Revolution, they do not fear to make blasphemous conciliations between the Gospel and the Revolution, which have not the excuse of being done in excitement and sudden hurry.

We would draw your close attention, Venerable Brethren, to this defacement of the Gospel and the sacred character of Our Lord Jesus Christ, God and Man, carried on in the *Sillon* and elsewhere. As soon as the social question is broached, it is the fashion in certain quarters first to make away with the divinity of Jesus Christ, and then only to speak of His sovereign gentleness, His compassion for all human misery, His pressing calls to love of our neighbour and to brotherhood. Jesus has indeed loved us with a boundless and infinite love; He came upon earth to suffer and die that all men, united round Him in justice and love, might live in peace and happiness. But for the realisation of this temporal and eternal happiness, He has, with sovereign authority, laid down the condition that men should be of His flock, accept His doctrine, practise virtue, and take their teaching and guidance from Peter and his successors. If, again, Jesus was kind to those who have strayed and sinned, He showed no tolerance for their erroneous convictions, however sincere they appeared to be; He has loved all to instruct, convert and save them. If He called those who labour and are heavy-burdened to Him to relieve them, it was not to preach to them an insane ambition for equality. If He raised the lowly, it was not to inspire them with the feeling of an independent dignity that refuses obedience. If His heart overflowed with gentleness for men of goodwill, He also knew how to arm Himself with a righteous indignation against those who profane the house of God, against the wretches who scandalise little ones, against governors who overwhelm the people under the weight of heavy burdens without raising a

finger to relieve them. He was as strong as He was tender; He reprimanded, threatened and chastised, knowing and teaching us that oftentimes fear is the beginning of wisdom, and that sometimes it is well to cut off a limb to save the body. Lastly, He never announced a reign of ideal felicity, which would know no suffering for the society of the future; rather did He, by precept and example, point the way of possible happiness on earth and perfect happiness in heaven—the royal road of the Cross. This is teaching which it would be wrong to apply only to individual life and eternal salvation; it is teaching which is eminently social, and reveals to us in Our Lord Jesus Christ something quite different from a mere humanitarianism utterly lacking in stability and authority.

THE CLERGY AND SOCIAL ACTION

For yourselves, Venerable Brethren, do you actively continue the work of the Saviour of mankind by the imitation of His sweetness and strength. Look tenderly on all human miseries, let no sorrow escape your pastoral solicitude, no cry find you indifferent. But, at the same time, preach their duties boldly to great and small; it is your duty to form the conscience of the people and of the public powers. The social question will be very near solution when both these, grown less exacting about their mutual rights, shall fulfill their duties more exactly. And as, moreover, in the conflict of interests, and especially in the struggle with dishonest forces, a man's virtue or sanctity even may not be sufficient to ensure him daily bread, and as social machinery ought to be so organized that by its natural play it should paralyse the efforts of the vicious and put their legitimate share of temporal happiness within the reach of all men of goodwill, it is our earnest wish that you shall take an active part in the organisation of society for this purpose. To this end, whilst your priests devote themselves with ardour to work for the sanctification of souls, the defence of the Church and works of charity strictly so-called, choose some from amongst them, men who are active and stable-minded, possessing the degrees of doctor in philosophy and theology, and a thorough knowledge of the history of ancient and modern civili-

sation, and apply them to the less elevated and more practical study of social science, in order that at the right time they may be put at the head of your Catholic action. And let not these priests allow themselves to be led away in the maze of contemporary opinion, by the mirage of a false democracy; let them not borrow from the rhetoric of the worst enemies of the Church and of the people an emphatic language which is crammed with promises as high-sounding as they are impossible. Let them remember that the social question and social science were not born yesterday; that at all times the Church and the State, happily working together, have established for this purpose organisations that have proved fruitful; that the Church which has never betrayed the happiness of the people by compromising alliances, has not to sever herself from the past, and that she has only to take up again, with the assistance of the true workers of the social restoration, the organisms destroyed by the Revolution, and in the same Christian spirit which inspired them, to adapt them to the new situation created by the material development of contemporary society; for the true friends of the people are neither revolutionaries nor innovators, but traditionalists.

5. ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF POPE PIUS X TO THE GERMAN HIERARCHY ON CATHOLIC AND CHRIS- TIAN LABOR UNIONS

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

FOR an intelligent understanding of this Encyclical of Pope Pius X, written in 1912, an explanation of the trade union conditions in Germany at this period is necessary. It will afford an occasion at the same time of explaining the nature of the Catholic and Christian labor unions that have long been in existence in various parts of Europe.

The modern labor movement in Germany was unfortunately dominated, almost from its inception, by atheistic influences. The two earliest classes of workingmen's associations, one Liberalistic and playing into the hands of the capitalists, the other frankly Socialistic, were equally bent upon destroying every vestige of faith in the hearts of the German people. These dangers were met at once by the organizations formed under the inspiration of the great Bishop Ketteler. Later developments did not change the antagonistic attitude towards religion assumed by the trade unions of the country. Catholics were thus obliged to form their own labor unions, whether in conjunction with members of other Christian denominations, or exclusively among themselves. Thus two classes of labor unions arose with Catholic membership, the one known as the Christian syndicates (*Christliche Gewerkschaften*), including Protestants who subscribed to their economic program, and the other retaining the name Catholic.

To explain the origin of the latter we must refer to the Workingmen's Associations (*Arbeitervereine*). To these the Pope also alludes, making the membership in them obligatory for every trade unionist belonging to the Christian syndicates, while the Socialist organizations are of course banned entirely.

The essential purpose of the Workingmen's Association is

not to champion the economic interests of the workers in their respective trades, but to offer the laborers an opportunity for the desired intellectual, moral and religious education, and to further their development in a manner that will make of them good citizens, loyal Catholics, and socially enlightened members of their own industrial class. Special work of an economic nature, that does not embrace trade-union activities, is also undertaken, such as the promotion of an active interest in the solution of the housing problem, and countless similar questions. The following detailed description of their manifold purpose is translated from their statutes as they existed at the date of the Encyclical, and is taken from the authoritative work upon this subject, by Dr. Otto Müller:¹

(1) Preservation and furtherance of religion and morality on the part of the members, in close connection with the Church.

(2) Instruction and enlightenment of members concerning the aims of Christian social reform and the combating of Socialistic errors.

(3) Instruction of members concerning their rights and duties as citizens.

(4) Protection and furtherance of the economic interests of the workingmen, particularly by educating them to cooperate practically in the efforts made for the social and economic uplifting of their state.

(5) Promotion of general education and vocational trade education among the members.

(6) Creation of benevolent institutions.

(7) Furtherance of the virtues of their state in life and a Christian refinement of their class-consciousness.

(8) Cultivation of a genuine fellowship, and promotion of ennobling entertainment and sociability.

Political purposes are strictly excluded. The organization is therefore an excellent application of the concept of Christian Democracy given to the world by Pope Leo XIII. The methods of attaining the purposes here described are:

(1) Solemn Communion on set days.

(2) Lectures upon topics mentioned for instruction.

(3) Social instruction courses for members able to follow them

¹ *Katholische Arbeitervereine. Ihre Notwendigkeit, Aufgabe und Einrichtungen, Soziale Tagesfragen*, No. 22.

with advantage. Establishment of commissions for carrying out practical social measures, etc.

(4) Foundation of a society library and the propagation of Catholic workingmen's literature.

(5) The founding, so far as possible, of savings banks or affiliation with those already in existence. Affiliation with central insurance organizations for cases of sickness and death.

(6) Arrangement of family feasts to which the wives of the members are also to be invited.

Meetings are held every fourteen days in winter, and as often as may be determined upon in summer. Annual general meetings take place to decide financial matters, etc., make changes in the statutes, etc. The guidance of the society rests with a priest duly appointed by his ecclesiastical superiors, known as the *Präses*. The pastor is honorary *Präses*.

What is here of particular importance is their relation to the trade unions. The Workingmen's Associations were soon federated into three great unions comprising separately the western, the southern and the so-called *Sitz-Berlin* sections.² The former two preferred to leave all active participation in trade union interests, concerning wages and labor, to the Christian syndicates, or trade unions, already described. Their method was to promote membership in the latter while the Christian syndicates were to reciprocate by urging their own Catholic trade unionists to join in turn the Workingmen's Association. Thus a friendly cooperation existed between these two separate organizations, each active within its own sphere, but working together for the religious, moral and intellectual, as well as for the economic and strictly trade-union interests of the laborer. All these purposes, with the exception of the last, were included within the scope of the Workingmen's Associations (*Arbeitervereine*) themselves.

The group of these latter organizations, however, known as *Sitz-Berlin*, wished also to include trade-union interests within their scope. Since the members of the *Arbeitervereine* are necessarily Catholics, a system of strictly Catholic trade unions thus spontaneously sprang into being, by merely extending the sphere of the Workingmen's Associations to an active participa-

² *Staatslexicon*, II, 764-765. Third edition, 1909.

tion in wage and labor interests. The contention now raised was that all Catholic laborers should unite in Catholic Syndicates or labor unions and relinquish the prospering Christian syndicates, with their partly Protestant membership. The actual proportion of Catholic and Protestant members in the Christian syndicates at the particular time when the Encyclical of Pope Pius X appeared may be gauged from the fact that among approximately 350,000 members, there were only from 70,000 to 90,000 Evangelicals.

The hope had been entertained that the Christian trade unions would in time become as strong as those of a Socialistic nature. The opposition to them on the part of the Catholic trade unions began with Savigny, who in 1891 maintained in the *Märischen Kirchenblatt* that interdenominational unions were not reconcilable with the Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, issued that same year. This contention he again defended in a brochure published in 1900.³

The Christian syndicates, on the other side, were expressly endorsed both by Bishop Fritzen of Strassburg and Cardinal Fisher of Cologne. The latter is regarded as the great pioneer and protector of the Christian labor movement of Cologne, and his views became identified with the thought processes of the Christian labor movement in his archdiocese. This movement may really, therefore, be considered as consisting of two coordinate branches: the Workingmen's Associations, *katholische Arbeitervereine*, for the work of a general economic enlightenment and progress, together with a religious and moral development of the Catholic laborer, on the one hand; and the Christian syndicates, or interdenominational trade unions, *christliche Gewerkschaften*, on the other, for the purely economic trade-union issues as interpreted in the spirit of Bishop Ketteler and Pope Leo XIII.⁴

The decision of the Holy Father, which has a pertinent application also in our time, can be thus briefly summarized:

While Catholic labor unions are the obvious ideal for Catholic workingmen, the conditions existing in Germany at the time

³ *Arbeitervereine und Gewerkschaften im Lichte der Encyklika rerum novarum.*

⁴ *Kölnische Volkszeitung*, Dec. 9, 1919.

are such that Christian, i.e. interdenominational, labor unions are not to be condemned. Catholics may with a free conscience join them, and their loyalty to the Catholic Faith is not therefore to be impugned. But it is necessary that proper provisions be taken to safeguard their religion and teach them the correct moral principles, since the social question is eminently a religious and moral question.

Hence every German Catholic laborer who joins a Christian union must also join a Catholic Workingmen's Association. Such is the express ruling wisely made in these circumstances.

Its application to countries where not even Christian labor unions, but purely neutral trade unions exist, is clear. The Catholic workingman belonging to such a union stands even much more in need of Catholic social instruction and every effort must be made to see that his faith is guarded, while correct economic principles are given to him and he is helped to realize all his justified ideals and ambitions. Where Socialism absorbs the trade-union movement of a country it becomes imperative for Catholic workingmen to have their own Catholic or Christian unions, accordingly as circumstances may require and justify. Such unions may then cooperate with the anti-Christian organizations in so far as just measures are defended, and the law of Christian charity is maintained. Splendid results have been achieved by them in many sections of Europe, although they have naturally been traduced by the Socialist internationals with all the unscrupulous methods of falsification at their command.⁵

Socialist unions in Germany would not prevent their members from acting as strike-breakers when there was question of a strike declared by Christian unions, while they would insist that their own strikes must be respected, as if the decision could rest with them alone. Such is the confusion Socialism has brought into the labor camps, preventing the harmonious cooperation of all the labor elements.

⁵ See: *Church and Trade Unions in Germany, an Attack and a Rejoinder*. An answer to such calumnies spread among American labor unionists. Published by the Central Bureau of the Central Verein, St. Louis.

THE LETTER

To Our Beloved Son, George Cardinal Kopp, Bishop of Breslau,
and to Our Venerable Brothers, the other Archbishops and
Bishops of Germany — Pius PP.X.

Beloved Son and Venerable Brothers, Health and the Apostolic
Benediction:

(*Singulari quadam*). Our special love and good will towards the Catholics of Germany, who are united to the Apostolic See by ties of closest allegiance and obedience, and who have always fought generously and strenuously for the Church, have impelled Us, Venerable Brothers, to devote all Our attention and care to the settlement of the controversy which exists among them concerning labor unions. It is a question that has frequently been brought to Our notice during recent years by several of yourselves and by prudent and sensible men belonging to both parties. We have devoted Ourselves all the more earnestly to this matter inasmuch as the sense of Our Apostolic office makes Us feel that it is Our sacred duty to strive and to ensure that these beloved children of Ours keep the Catholic doctrine unadulterated and entire, and on no account allow their faith to be endangered. For there is evident danger that if they are not promptly stimulated to be on their guard they may gradually and, as it were, unconsciously, settle down into that species of vague and indefinite Christianity, known as "Interconfessionalism," which is now being diffused on the false plea of a common Christian faith, whereas nothing could be more clearly opposed to the preaching of Jesus Christ. Moreover, as it is Our most ardent desire to foster and consolidate harmony among Catholics, we wish to see every possible cause removed which can breed those dissensions that divide the energies of the good, and serve only the interests of the enemies of religion. So too We desire that, together with their fellow-countrymen who do not profess the Catholic faith, they cultivate that peace without which neither social order nor national prosperity can exist.

ASKED FOR OPINIONS

But although, as We have said, We understood the state of this question, We have been pleased, before deciding it, to ask each of you, Venerable Brothers, for his opinion, and you at Our request have individually answered with the diligence and care that the importance of the matter called for.

In the first place, we therefore insist that it is the duty of all Catholics, a duty to be faithfully and inviolately observed both in private and in common and public life, to hold firmly and to profess unshrinkingly the principles of Christian truth entrusted to the teaching authority of the Catholic Church. We refer especially to those principles set forth most advisedly by Our Predecessor in the encyclical *Rerum novarum*, which, as We know, the Bishops of Prussia, who met at Fulda in 1900, closely followed in their deliberations, and which We realize you yourselves have also had in mind in writing back to Us your opinion on this question. To wit:

That whatever a Christian may do, even in the order of earthly things, he is never permitted to disregard the good that is above nature, but according to the dictates of Christian wisdom must look to the supreme good as to his ultimate end; and that all his actions, in as far as they are good or bad in the order of morals,—i.e. in as far as they are in harmony or in conflict with the natural and Divine law — come under the judgment and jurisdiction of the Church.

That all who, as individuals or as members of an organization, glory in the Christian name should be mindful of their duty to promote among the classes of society not enmities and hidden grudges, but mutual peace and charity.

That the social question and the controversies connected with it regarding the conditions and hours of labor, salaries or strikes, are not of a purely economic character and therefore not of a kind that can be settled without reference to the authority of the Church, "since on the contrary, it is altogether true that [the social question] is first of all a moral and religious one, and therefore to be settled mainly by the moral law and the judgment of religion."⁶

⁶ Encyclical *Graves de Communi.*

WORKINGMEN'S SOCIETIES

Now, with reference to workingmen's societies, although their object is to secure temporal advantages for their members, those are to be regarded as worthy of the highest approval, and as the best fitted to promote the real and solid utility of their members, which are founded chiefly on the basis of the Catholic religion and openly follow the leadership of the Church. This We have Ourselves several times declared for different nations, as occasion offered. Hence it follows that such Catholic associations should be established and favored in every way, certainly in Catholic countries and in all other places also where it appears that through them provision can be made for the various needs of their members. In the case of associations which directly or indirectly touch the cause of religion or morals, We cannot in any way approve the attempt to promote or propagate mixed associations, that is, those which are made up of Catholics and non-Catholics, *in the countries just mentioned*. For, to say nothing of other reasons, the integrity of the faith of Our own people and their just respect for the laws and precepts of the Church are, or certainly may be, greatly endangered through such societies. Of the existence of these dangers We find an open acknowledgment, Venerable Brothers, in many of your answers on this question.

THE CARTEL

Hence We gladly bestow all praise on the purely Catholic workingmen's associations in Germany, and We wish them success in all their efforts to promote the welfare of the toiling multitudes, and hope they will develop ever more and more happily. But in saying this We do not deny that, to better the state of the worker, and his wages, the conditions of labor, or for any other honest and useful purpose, it is lawful for Catholics to work in common with non-Catholics for the common welfare, provided the proper precaution is taken. But We prefer that in doing this, Catholic societies and non-Catholic societies be united in that kind of happily devised understanding known as the Cartel.

CHRISTIAN SYNDICATES

But here, Venerable Brothers, many of you ask Us that you be permitted by Us to tolerate what are known as the Christian Syndicates [i.e. Christian Trade Unions],⁷ as they exist at present in your dioceses, on the ground that the number of workingmen they contain is far greater than that of the purely Catholic associations and that grave inconveniences would follow if such permission were withheld. This petition We think well to grant in view of the special conditions of Catholicism in Germany, and We declare that it is tolerated and permitted for Catholics to join these mixed societies which exist in your dioceses, as long as new circumstances do not make this tolerance inopportune and unjust. This, however, We grant on condition [*ita tamen*] that suitable precautions be taken to obviate those dangers which, as We have said, are to be found in such organizations. The chief of these precautions are as follows: First of all, care is to be taken that the Catholic workers who are members of those syndicates be enrolled also in those Catholic societies for workingmen which are called Workingmen's Associations [*Arbeitervereine*]. Should this entail some sacrifice to them, especially of money, we take it for certain that, eager as they are for the preservation of their faith, they will willingly make it. For experience happily shows that these Catholic associations, thanks to the clergy under whose leadership and vigilance they are conducted, contribute greatly towards preserving the purity of the faith and the good moral conduct of their members and towards fostering their religious spirit by various pious exercises. Thus there can be no doubt that the leaders of these associations, with their knowledge of present conditions, will communicate to the workingmen those precepts and prescriptions which they know to be necessary or useful for them, so that they may properly be members of the syndicates and live according to the principles of Catholic teaching.

⁷ *Christliche Gewerkschaften.*

DUTIES OF BISHOPS

Moreover, these syndicates, to be fit for Catholic members, must refrain from all methods and acts out of harmony with the doctrines and commands of the Church or of legitimate sacred authority, and their writings, utterances or doings must in this respect contain nothing reprehensible. Hence the Bishops are to consider it a most sacred duty, to observe carefully how these societies are conducted and to see that Catholics take no harm from intercourse with them. And the Catholic members of these syndicates in their own turn, must never permit the syndicates, even as such, while looking after the earthly advantages of their members, to profess or do things in anyways contrary to the precepts entrusted to the supreme teaching authority of the Church, and especially to those maxims we have mentioned above. To this end, whenever questions arise affecting moral topics, that is, of justice or charity, the Bishops shall watch most carefully that the faithful do not disregard the Catholic code of morals or depart so much as a hair's breadth from its observance.

We are, indeed, certain, Venerable Brothers, that you will see that these prescriptions of Ours are religiously and inviolately observed, and that you will diligently and assiduously keep Us informed on a matter of such moment. Since We have taken this question upon Ourselves, We reserve to Ourselves all decisions concerning it. With the advice of the Bishops, we enjoin upon all good Catholics to abstain hereafter from all controversy among themselves on the subject. We are pleased to believe that, observing fraternal charity and showing entire obedience to Our authority and that of their pastors, they will carry out fully and heartily what We order. Should any difficulty arise they have a ready means for settling it: let them approach their Bishops and lay the matter before them and let the latter submit the question to this Apostolic See, which will decide it.

PEACE AND PROGRESS

We need but add, as indeed is clear from what We have said, that no Catholics who are constant in their defense of the teach-

ings and rights of the Church, and who, with a proper intention, wish to be or are members of the mixed syndicates in places where the religious authority has seen fit to permit membership in them because of local conditions, shall be attacked or accused as suspect in the Faith,—understanding that all necessary precautions are taken. So, too, it would be highly reprehensible to pursue with hostility the purely Catholic associations — which indeed are to be helped and promoted in every way, and to try to introduce and, as it were, to impose the interconfessional trade unions, on the pretext, among other reasons, of reducing all the societies of Catholics in the various dioceses to one and the same form.

Meanwhile, in Our desire that Catholic Germany may enjoy great progress, both religious and civil, We implore for this happy end the special assistance of Almighty God and the protection of the Virgin Mother of God, who is the Queen of Peace, and as an augury of Divine gifts and a pledge of Our special affection, We most lovingly impart the Apostolic Benediction to you, Beloved Son and Venerable Brothers, and to your clergy and people.

Given at Rome at St. Peter's, September 24th, 1912, in the tenth year of Our Pontificate.

PIUS, PP. X.

6. LETTER SENT BY POPE BENEDICT XV
THROUGH CARDINAL GASPARRI TO CARDINAL
LUCON, ARCHBISHOP OF RHEIMS¹

YOUR EMINENCE,—The Holy Father has duly received the copy which Your Eminence sent to him, of the recent Joint Letter of the French Episcopate, reminding the Catholics of France of the principles which should govern families, societies and States. In addressing, in the person of Your Eminence, the Cardinals, Archbishops and Bishops of France, his thanks for that communication, the Sovereign Pontiff not only approves the exposition of those principles which will be developed and stated in detail according to circumstances, but he praises the opportuneness of the moment chosen for their recall to the French people.

And indeed, as the letter of the Bishops so well puts it, after the victory achieved by force of arms at the cost of a five years' struggle unparalleled in history, it is now a question of restoring the material and moral ruins wrought by the war. If the former can be restored by the resumption of economic activity and the financial assistance of the State, the latter are only to be remedied by bringing back the people to the principles of the Christian faith and morality. Thence it is seen how large a factor for the uplifting of the country is the influence of the Catholic Church, with the unceasing assistance of the Holy Spirit.

Coming to a particular point, who does not see that henceforth the current flows ever more and more strongly towards democracy? The proletariat, as it is called, having taken a preponderant part in the war, is anxious in every country to obtain from it the greatest possible advantages. Unfortunately,

¹ This letter was written in the summer of 1919, and was addressed to the French Episcopate in acknowledgment of the receipt of the Pastoral Letter issued by that body. An extract from the Pastoral appears on a later page of this volume. It will be observed that this and the other two pronouncements by Pope Benedict on the social question were called forth by special occasions, and that the principal note in all three of them is insistence upon the authority and efficacy of the social doctrines of Pope Leo XIII.

they are often deceived and pushed to excesses which, in overturning the social order that is conformable to human nature itself, turn finally to the detriment of all, and are especially damaging to the workers and those less fortunately placed. That has happened to other nations which till recently were prosperous, but are now reduced to an extremity of misery which they would like to extend to all Europe, and even the whole world; and is not this a plain proof of what we say?

The Catholic Church has ever been the friend of those who are in trouble; she has always taught that the public authorities, established for the welfare of all, should strive especially for the betterment of the condition of those who suffer. That is why, as the Bishops so well say, the clergy and people, instead of merely opposing the claims of the proletariat, ought to support them, provided that they are within the bounds of what is just and honest, as set forth clearly in the immortal encyclical *Rerum Novarum* of Leo XIII. In order that these bounds be the more surely respected and the direful excesses above referred to avoided, the Bishops give the Catholics of France the pertinent counsel of cultivating union amongst themselves and with other citizens of good will, whilst following the directions given by the Popes in the past and never revoked.

The Holy Father is confident that French Catholics will show quite special readiness to remain faithful to the exhortations, counsels, and commands of the Holy See and of their zealous pastors. They will thus work for the general good of their beloved country, for present harmony amongst all classes which is an essential condition of the happiness of peoples, and at the same time will bring back to Jesus Christ those who to their own misfortune have strayed away from their adorable Master.

In this hope His Holiness renews with all his paternal heart his blessings to the venerable Episcopate of France; and I myself take occasion to offer to Your Eminence the homage of profound veneration with which I kiss your hand and remain,

Your Eminence's humble and devoted servant,

P. CARDINAL GASPARRI.

7. LETTER SENT BY POPE BENEDICT XV
THROUGH CARDINAL GASPARRI TO M. EUGENE
DUTHOIT, PRESIDENT OF THE *SEMAINES*
*SOCIALES DE FRANCE*¹

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Holy Father was not surprised at the step so respectful and trusting you were eager to take in his regard at the moment when, as president of the general commission of the *Semaines de France*, you succeeded the late lamented Henri Larin. By coming in your own name and that of your colleagues to place at the feet of His Holiness the homage of your common filial piety and faithful adherence to his directions, you were carrying out a tradition most dear to the friend whom you cannot forget, and you made evident your intention of never departing from it.

At the same time you showed how lively and how enlightened is your consciousness of your Christian responsibilities. According to the words which are, as it were, the device of your *semaines sociales*, you have in view the cultivation of knowledge for practical ends, and you attentively observe the complete and changing reality of social facts: thus you neglect nothing which could make clear the positive data of the problems which are of as vital concern to the Church as to civil society, the salvation of souls and the common welfare of your country. But you are profoundly convinced that although these problems arise in the material order of economic interests, yet they are moral problems in their very essence, and for this reason their solution is governed by the doctrine of which the Church is the infallible guardian. Therefore, your heart and mind are always disposed to receive eagerly the teachings of him to whom the Divine Master has entrusted the care of safeguarding all the members of His flock against error. What characterizes particularly all your work is the constant care to

¹ In the summer of 1919.

attain a most scientific accuracy in the study of facts, a delicate and manly docility towards the authority of the Church, and this line of conduct, in fact, is incumbent on whomsoever, in accordance with the explicit desire quite recently expressed by His Holiness Benedict XV, intends to make easy for the people the concrete solution of the problems which confront them.

Animated by such dispositions, you could not fail to receive with gratitude the recent manifestations of the Pope's judgment on the importance, more timely than ever before, of the encyclical *Rerum Novarum*. The Holy Father praises you unreservedly for having understood so well — as he himself said in the discourse to which I have just alluded — that the length of time already elapsed since the publication of this document has not detracted from its force, nor diminished its pertinence, and that on the contrary the very series of events, while justifying the sombre colors with which he depicted the various classes of modern society, has brought out in still more striking relief the fact that agreement among the social classes cannot be realized save by the triumph of justice and charity.

If then, one wishes to restore to society the balance which seems almost everywhere disturbed, one must, more than ever, have recourse to this admirable document of pontifical wisdom, in which are recalled the rights and duties of each one; rights in all their fulness but with their limits; duties inseparable from rights and like them shared by every member of the human family. For the encyclical *Rerum Novarum* does not speak only of the rights of employers or only of the duties of workmen,— His Holiness, Benedict XV, expressly insists on this,— but to employers it is therein said that if they have rights, they must not forget that they have duties which bind them strictly, and to the workman. It is therein said that if the workers must fulfill the duties proper to their condition they must not derive from them a feeling of discouragement as if they also had no rights. There is no one who does not perceive the reasonableness of these teachings; it were in fact a proceeding equally harmful, as the august Pontiff strongly expresses it, to attribute only rights to the various classes of

society, or to wish to assign to them duties only. "Now," continues the Pope, "if this opportuneness was rightly praised at the time of the publication of the encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*, it seems that it should be no less praised in our day when the common heritage of rights and of duties is not yet generally accepted as an inevitable disposition of Divine Providence."

You are come, Mr. President, to repeat to the Vicar of Jesus Christ your firm resolve and that of all your colleagues, to be always guided by his teachings in all the lectures of your *Semaines Sociales* and in every movement which emanates therefrom. The Holy Father knows that in receiving from you these assurances freely offered he heard the very echo of your souls, and that he can count on them in the great work which the charity of Christ urges him to accomplish — I mean, the practical realization through the ministry of the Apostolic See of the *misereor super turbam* which the Heart of Our Lord Jesus Christ breathes forth in presence of the bewildered human multitude. Therefore does the august Pontiff ask Our Divine Savior to bless your good-will, to fill your souls with a zeal ever purer and more enlightened, and to reward your fidelity to the Holy See by the growing fruitfulness of your social apostolate. He is pleased to give this interpretation to the very paternal blessing which he himself grants you most cordially, and which I am most happy to transmit to you, as well as to the organizers, professors and members of the *Semaines Sociales de France*.

Devotedly yours in Christ,
PETER CARDINAL GASPARRI.

8. LETTER OF POPE BENEDICT XV TO THE RIGHT
REVEREND ALOYSIUS MARY MARELLI, BISHOP
OF BERGAMO, CONCERNING PRESCRIPTIONS OF
THE APOSTOLIC SEE ON THE SOCIAL QUES-
TION ¹

VENERABLE BROTHER, HEALTH AND APOSTOLIC BENECTION.

WE, being accustomed to consider our dear Bergamaschians with great favor on account of their high repute for morals and traditions exemplarily Christian, have heard with great pain unfavorable reports concerning certain disturbances among the people which are said to have taken place there recently. Of course, it is not to be wondered at that the enemy, who has long been pining away with envy at the fertility of this part of the Lord's field, and who has been eagerly awaiting the opportunity of doing it harm, should have made use of the occasion offered by these most unfortunate times to oversow this joyful and fruitful grain with tares. But since, indeed, bad seed when once it has taken root can choke even the good grain, we must by every means in our power check its growth. For to us the Lord has entrusted the care of this entire mystical field. Accordingly, we appeal to you, with this letter, not that we have any doubts of your pastoral solicitude,

¹ This letter was called forth by the violent actions and revolutionary utterances of a group of Catholic laborers and members of the Popular Party (Catholic) in Bergamo. The former attacked the factories in which they were employed and the houses of the factory owners; the latter passed resolutions in favor of Russian bolshevism, and the socialization of land and industries. Two priests as well as one Catholic member of the Italian parliament, took a prominent part in the meeting at which these resolutions were adopted. In a sense this letter supplements the two preceding documents of Pope Benedict on the social question. While the others are devoted mainly to the subject of reforms, the present statement emphasizes the necessity of employing lawful and moderate methods, of opposing Socialism, and of remembering always that material well being is only a means to, not the true end of, human life. At the same time, the Pope reaffirms the obligation of all who occupy positions of influence, especially the clergy, to the work of Christian social reform.

of which you have given public proof in this very affair, but because we deem it timely to exhort our beloved children, by means of you, to persevere in their duty; this we trust they will do with even more alacrity when they see that your authority has the backing of ours

At the outset, we desire that all should know that we approve completely the course of action which you took, when at the end of the war, as all were returning to their usual occupations interrupted by the war, you, hastening to the assistance of the needy and having employed the diocesan Council, established a special bureau of labor, which had for its object to take care of the interests of the various classes of workingmen. An excellent institution, indeed, and exceedingly profitable, if it be managed rightly, that is, according to the dictates of religion; otherwise, it is abundantly evident of how much disorder it may be the cause. Therefore, before all else it is necessary that those who are in charge of this bureau of labor, which is closely bound up with the common welfare, should ever have before their eyes and most religiously observe the principles of social science inculcated by the Holy See in the memorable Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*, and in other documents. Let them, in particular, bear in mind these fundamental points: to no one is it given to be perfectly happy in this brief mortal life, which is subject to misery of every sort; true, absolute, and everlasting happiness, as the reward of a life well-spent has been promised us in heaven; thither we must direct our gaze in all our actions; for that very reason we must not be so insistent upon demanding our rights as in discharging our obligations; on the other hand, even in this life it is allowed us, as far as we can, to better our condition, and seek for ourselves greater comforts; but for promoting the common weal nothing is of greater value than concord and harmony among the various classes of society; in this Christian charity is the prime mover.

Let them see how badly those consult for the interests of the working-man who, professing to have as their program to ameliorate his condition, try simply to aid him in securing transient and perishable possessions, and not only fail to regulate his

mind by warning him of his duties as a Christian, but actually set him against the rich, bringing this about by the cogency and bitterness of that type of speech by means of which our adversaries have been wont to excite the masses to social revolution. Towards averting so great a calamity, Venerable Brother, it shall be the part of your vigilant solicitude to warn, as you have already begun to do, all those who are championing the cause of the workingmen, that, avoiding the intemperate language of the Socialists, they thoroughly leaven their undertaking and propaganda with the Christian spirit, without which, however much they may harm, certainly they cannot help. It pleases us to hope that all will be guided by you; however, should any one refuse to heed you, you will, without hesitation, remove him from office.

However, towards bringing about the Christian uplift of the lower classes, it behooves those to contribute more who have been furnished with greater means by Divine favor and bounty. Thus, let those who are raised above the rest either in social position or in education not refuse to aid the workman by their advice, prestige and authority, by fostering particularly those various institutions which have been providentially established for his advantage. Let those who abound in riches be unwilling to demand their rights from the proletariat according to the strict interpretation of law, but rather let them be guided by the norm of equity. Nay, we earnestly exhort that in this matter they act even indulgently, generously and liberally, giving way and relaxing as much as they can, in their demands. What St. Paul says to Timothy is appropriate here: "Charge the rich of this world . . . to give easily, to communicate to others."²

In this way, they will gradually win back the affections of the poor, whom the consciousness of their avarice had estranged. Moreover, let those who belong to a lower rank of society or who are poor be thoroughly convinced that the distinction of social classes springs from nature, and in the last analysis is to be traced back to the will of God, *quoniam pusillum et magnum ipse fecit*² and this works most aptly both for

¹ Tim. vi, 17-18.

² Wis., vi, 8.

the good of the individual and of the community. Let them also be persuaded that, however much they have done towards bettering their condition by their own industry and with the help of the good, there shall ever be left for them, as for others, not a little to suffer. Therefore, if they are wise, they will not strive in vain to realize the unattainable, but will rather strive peacefully and courageously to bear those evils which they cannot escape, having the hope of eternal possessions ever in view.

Accordingly, we implore and beseech the Bergamaschians by their signal devotion and esteem for this Holy See not to suffer themselves to be deceived by the trickery of those who with certain wonderful promises endeavor to tear them from their ancestral faith, that in turn they may drive them on to violence and social revolution. Not by employing violence or by greatly menacing the social order is the cause of justice and truth served, for these are arms that badly wound those, first of all, who use them.

Now it is the duty of priests and particularly of pastors to combat vigorously such pernicious enemies of Catholic and civil society, with united effort among themselves, and cooperating zealously under your leadership, Venerable Brother. Let no one of these think that there is question here of an activity which is foreign to the sacred ministry because it has to do with economics; for in this very social question the eternal salvation of souls is imperilled. Wherefore we desire that they count among their duties to apply themselves as much as they can, in their studies and by their vigilance and activities, to the theory and practice of social science, and that they aid with all their resources those who were engaged in our organizations. At the same time, let them diligently teach those entrusted to their care the laws of Christian life and both apprise them of the snares of the Socialists and promote everything that may tend to their economic betterment, reminding them always, however, of what the Church prays for: that we may so pass through temporal goods as not to lose the eternal.

In the meantime, we shall not cease to implore the divine goodness for favors in your behalf; as a pledge of which and

as a sign of our particular goodwill, we most lovingly impart, Venerable Brother, the Apostolic Benediction to you and to your people.

Given at Rome on the 11th day of March in the year 1920 and the 6th of our pontificate.

BENEDICT XV, Pope.

III FOUR CARDINALS

- 1. Memorial Presented to the Holy See on the Knights of Labor by His Eminence, James Cardinal Gibbons.**
- 2. Review of Pope Leo's Encyclical on the Condition of Labor, by His Eminence, Henry Edward Cardinal Manning.**
- 3. Pastoral Letter on the Laborer's Rights, by His Eminence, William Cardinal O'Connell.**
- 4. Pastoral Letter on Catholics and Social Reform, by His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Bourne.**

1. MEMORIAL PRESENTED TO THE HOLY SEE BY
CARDINAL GIBBONS ON THE KNIGHTS OF
LABOR ¹

PREFATORY NOTE

A FEW words of explanation will be necessary that the reader may understand the causes which led up to my presenting the following document to the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda.

Ever since the Reformation the democratic and co-operative institutions of medieval Europe have been upon their death-bed. In the year 1500 most Englishmen, for instance, owned their own homes, but by 1600 between two-thirds and three-fourths only were still in possession of their own lands. By 1700 one-half still had the economic buttress of a home behind them; but by the year 1900 less than one-tenth of the population possessed all the land of the country.

And what is true of real property is true also of the means of production. Trade and business in the middle ages were conducted on the principles of mutual help and assistance, and unlimited competition was never thought of. But with the breaking down of the corporate feeling of united Christendom, methods of business were introduced which would have seemed deeply immoral 100 years before.

The discovery of the New World with its abounding riches and consequent opportunities for exploitation was another factor which greatly increased the evil. But what brought these economic evils to a head was the invention of machinery in the last half of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century.

¹ From *A Retrospect of Fifty Years*, by James Cardinal Gibbons. Published by John Murphy Company, Baltimore. The kind permission of the publisher to include this matter in this volume is gratefully acknowledged.

Those who live in these days cannot conceive the state of society in the seventies and the eighties. The money of the country was not only concentrated into the hands of a very few people, but by means of this money this small oligarchy was put in the position of getting complete control of our free institutions. The mass of people dispossessed of land and of the means of production, and retaining only a figment of political power, were by no means satisfied with this arrangement. All the more so, as large numbers of the working people, that is to say the dispossessed, were members of the Catholic Church, and among Roman Catholics there is and must always be a memory of a better tradition which preserved to every man as much individual liberty as was compatible with the rights of his fellow men.

Accordingly numerous societies for the protection of the working-man rose during the administration of President Cleveland — societies to which working people began to adhere more and more steadfastly as their only protection from economic slavery, but which were vehemently attacked upon the other side as destructive, revolutionary and even anarchic; and indeed the oppression of the wealthy was driving the poor into excesses of which the anarchist riots of Chicago were but one example.

These societies could not long escape the wise oversight of the Church, and it was a foregone conclusion that in a few years the principle of such organizations of working people must either be approved or condemned. On the one hand, great numbers of Ecclesiastics were alarmed at the revolutionary principles which undoubtedly disgraced some members of the trade unions; the more so, as many of them were at least nominally secret societies. So great was this alarm in Canada that the Canadian Bishops obtained from the Holy See a condemnation of the Knights of Labor for Canada. But if many Bishops were alarmed at what they considered the revolutionary tendencies of these associations, many other Bishops, including Cardinal Manning and myself, were equally alarmed at the prospect of the Church being presented before our age as the friend of the powerful rich and the enemy of the helpless

poor; for not only would such an alliance or even apparent alliance, have done the Church untold harm, but it would have been the bouleversement of our whole history. Moreover, to us it seemed that such a thing could never take place. The one body in the world which had been the protector of the poor and the weak for nearly 1800 years, could not possibly desert these same classes in their hour of need.

It was under such circumstances that I consulted with Mr. Cleveland, President of the United States, and Mr. Powderly, who was head of the Knights of Labor, and at a meeting of the Archbishops of the country I asked Mr. Powderly to tell their Graces exactly what the obligation of secrecy consisted in. This he very kindly consented to do, and he showed us plainly on that occasion, first, that secrecy was only enjoined upon the members by a simple pledge, and not by an oath; secondly, that this secrecy was only approved by the society of the Knights of Labor in so far as it was necessary to protect their business from enemies, thirdly; that there was nothing in the obligation of secrecy which would prevent any individual manifesting his conscience in the tribunal of Penance privately, or which would prevent the heads of the order from giving the necessary assurances and manifesting everything to competent ecclesiastical authority even outside of confession.

Only two out of the twelve Archbishops were for condemnation; the rest agreed with me that we must do all in our power to prevent any such condemnation of the Knights of Labor in our own country, as would drive them into the camp of revolution.

Accordingly when I sailed for Europe in 1887 to receive the Cardinal's Hat it was part of my mission to present the plea of organized labor, which I did by presenting the following document to the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda. I cannot say that the task which I had imposed upon myself was an easy one, but I am thankful to say that it proved not an impossible one, and that the Knights of Labor in the United States were not condemned.

It was a great consolation to me when a few years afterward the late Pontiff, Leo XIII, annunciated the principles

which underlie the Church's moral teaching with regard to economics, in his famous Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*.²

THE MEMORIAL

"To His Eminence Cardinal Simeoni, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda:

"Your Eminence — In submitting to the Holy See the conclusions which, after several months of attentive observation and reflection, seem to me to sum up the truth concerning the association of the Knights of Labor, I feel profoundly convinced of the vast importance of the consequences attaching to this question, which is but a link in the great chain of the social problems of our day, and especially of our country.

"In treating this question I have been very careful to follow as my constant guide the spirit of the encyclical letters, in which our Holy Father Leo XIII has so admirably set forth the dangers of our times and their remedies, as well as the principles by which we are to recognize associations condemned by the Holy See. Such was also the guide of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore in its teachings concerning the principles to be followed and the dangers to be shunned by the faithful either in the choice or in the establishment of those various forms of association toward which the spirit of our popular institutions so strongly impels them. And, considering the evil consequences that might result from a mistake in the treatment of organizations which often count their members by thousands and hundreds of thousands, the council wisely ordained (n. 225) that, when an association is spread over several dioceses, not even the bishop of one of these dioceses shall condemn it, but shall refer the case to a standing committee consisting of all the archbishops of the United States; and even these are not authorized to condemn, unless their sentence be unanimous; and in case they fail to agree unanimously, then only the supreme tribunal of the Holy See can

² In preparing this Memorial, I gratefully acknowledge the valuable aid of the venerable Archbishop Ireland, of St. Paul, and of Rt. Rev. Bishop Keane, who were then in Rome.

impose a condemnation: all this in order to avoid error and confusion of discipline.

"This committee of archbishops held a meeting towards the end of last October, at which the association of the Knights of Labor was specially considered. To this we were not impelled by the request of any of our bishops, for none of them had asked it; and I must add that among all the bishops we know of but two or three who desire the condemnation. But our reason was the importance attached to the question by the Holy See itself, and this led us to examine it with all possible care. After our deliberations, the result of which has already been communicated to the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, only two out of the twelve archbishops voted for condemnation, and their reasons were powerless to convince the others of either the justice or the prudence of such condemnation.

"In the following considerations I wish to state in detail the reasons which determined the vote of the great majority of the committee — reasons whose truth and force seem to me all the more evident after this lapse of time; nor will I fail to do justice to the arguments advanced on the other side:"

[Here follows a brief description of the main features of the society: no oath taken in the initiation; only a qualified secrecy in the deliberations; no promise of blind obedience; no hostility to religion, nor to the authority and laws of the country. After a short statement of the grievous social evils which the Knights of Labor sought to abolish, and of the necessity of organization for that purpose, His Eminence continues]:

"4. Let us now consider the objections made against this sort of organization.

"(a) It is objected that in such organizations, Catholics are mixed with Protestants, to the peril of their faith. Naturally, yes; they are mixed with Protestants at their work; for, in a mixed people like ours the separation of religious creeds in civil affairs is an impossibility. But to suppose that the faith of our Catholics suffers thereby is not to know the Catholic working men of America, who are not like the

working men of so many European countries — misguided children, estranged from their Mother, the Church, and regarding her with suspicion and dread — but intelligent, well-instructed and devoted Catholics, ready to give their blood, if necessary, as they continually give their hard-earned means, for her support and protection. And, in fact, it is not here a question of Catholics mixed with Protestants, but rather that Protestants are admitted to share in the advantages of an association, many of whose members and officers are Catholics; and, in a country like ours, their exclusion would be simply impossible.

“(b) But it is asked, instead of such an organization, could there not be confraternities, in which the working men would be united under the direction of the clergy and the influence of religion? I answer frankly that I do not consider this either possible or necessary in our country. I sincerely admire the efforts of this sort which are made in countries where the working people are led astray by the enemies of religion, but, thanks be to God, that is not our condition. We find that in our country the presence and direct influence of the clergy would not be advisable where our citizens, without distinction of religious belief, come together in regard to their industrial interests alone. Short of that we have abundant means for making our working people faithful Catholics, and simple good sense advises us not to go to extremes.

“(c) Again, it is objected that, in such organizations, Catholics are exposed to the evil influences of the most dangerous associates, even of atheists, communists and anarchists. That is true, but it is one of those trials of faith which our brave American Catholics are accustomed to meet almost daily, and which they know how to face with good sense and firmness. The press of our country tells us, and the president of the Knights has related to us, how these violent, aggressive elements have endeavored to control the association, or to inject poison into its principles; but they also inform us with what determination these machinators have been repulsed and beaten.

“The presence among our citizens of those dangerous social elements, which have mostly come from certain countries of

Europe, is assuredly for us an occasion of great regret and of vigilant precautions; it is a fact, however, which we have to accept, but which the close union between the Church and her children that exists in our country renders comparatively free from danger. In truth, the only thing from which we would fear serious danger would be a cooling of this relationship between the Church and her children, and I know nothing that would be more likely to occasion it than imprudent condemnations.

"(d) A specially weighty charge is drawn from the outbursts of violence, even to bloodshed, which have accompanied several of the strikes inaugurated by labor organizations. Concerning this, three things are to be remarked — first, strikes are not an invention of the Knights of Labor, but a means almost everywhere and always resorted to by the working classes to protect themselves against what they consider injustice, and in assertion of what they believe to be their just rights; secondly, in such a struggle of the poor and indignant multitudes against hard and obstinate monopoly, outbursts of anger are almost as inevitable as they are greatly to be regretted; thirdly, the laws and the chief authorities of the Knights of Labor, far from encouraging violence or the occasions of it, exercise a powerful influence to hinder it, and to retain strikes within the limits of good order and of legitimate action.

"A careful examination of the acts of violence accompanying the struggle between capital and labor last year leaves us convinced that it would be unjust to attribute them to the association of the Knights of Labor, for this association was but one among the numerous labor organizations that took part in the strikes, and their chief officers used every possible effort, as disinterested witnesses testify, to appease the anger of the multitudes, and to hinder the excesses which, therefore, in my judgment, could not justly be attributed to them. Doubtless, among the Knights of Labor, as among the thousands of other workingmen, there are to be found passionate or even wicked men who have committed inexcusable deeds of violence, and have instigated their associates to the same, but to attribute this to the association would, it seems to me, be as unreasonable

as to attribute to the Church the follies or the crimes of her children against which she strives and protests.

"I repeat that, in such a struggle of the great masses of the people against the mail-clad power which, as it is acknowledged, often refuses them the simple rights of humanity and justice, it is vain to expect that every error and every act of violence can be avoided; and to dream that this struggle can be hindered, or that we can deter the multitudes from organizing, which is their only hope of success; would be to ignore the nature and forces of human society in times like ours. Christian prudence evidently counsels us to hold the hearts of the multitudes by the bonds of love, in order to control their actions by the principles of faith, justice and charity, to acknowledge frankly what is true and just in their cause, in order to deter them from what is false and criminal, and thus to turn into a legitimate, peaceable and beneficent contest that might easily, by a course of repulsive severity, become for the masses of our people a dread volcanic force like unto that which society fears and the Church deplores in Europe.

"Upon this point I insist strongly, because, from an intimate acquaintance with the social conditions of our country I am profoundly convinced that here we are touching upon a subject which not only concerns the rights of the working classes, who ought to be especially dear to the Church which our Lord sent forth to preach His Gospel to the poor, but with which are intimately bound up the fundamental interests of the Church and of human society for the future. This is a point which I desire, in a few additional words, to develop more clearly.

"5. Whoever meditates upon the ways in which divine Providence is guiding mankind in our days cannot fail to remark how important is the part which the power of the people takes in shaping the events of the present, and which it is evidently destined to take in molding the destinies of the future. We, behold, with profound regret, the efforts of the prince of darkness to make this power dangerous to the social weal by withdrawing the masses of the people from the influence of religion, and impelling them towards the ruinous paths of license and anarchy. Hitherto our country has presented a

spectacle of a most consoling different character — that of a popular power regulated by love of good order, respect for religion, by obedience to the authority of the laws, not a democracy of license and violence, but that true democracy which aims at the general prosperity through the means of sound principles and good social order.

“In order to preserve so desirable a state of things it is absolutely necessary that religion should continue to possess the affections, and thus rule the conduct of the multitudes. As Cardinal Manning has well written, ‘A new task is before us. The Church has no longer to deal with Parliaments and princes, but with the masses and with the people. Whether we will or no this is our work; we need a new spirit and a new law of life.’ To lose influence over the people would be to lose the future altogether; and it is by the heart, far more than by the understanding, that we must hold and guide this immense power, so mighty either for good or for evil.

“Among all the glorious titles which the Church’s history has deserved for her, there is not one which at present gives her so great influence as that of ‘Friend of the People.’ Assuredly, in our democratic country, it is this title which wins for the Catholic Church not only the enthusiastic devotedness of the millions of her children, but also the respect and admiration of all our citizens, whatever be their religious belief. It is the power of this title which renders persecution almost an impossibility, and which draws towards our Holy Church the great heart of the American people.

“And since it is acknowledged by all that the great questions of the future are not those of war, of commerce or finance, but the social questions — the questions which concern the improvement of the condition of the great popular masses, and especially of the working people — it is evidently of supreme importance that the Church should always be found on the side of humanity — of justice towards the multitudes who compose the body of the human family. As the same Cardinal Manning has wisely written, ‘I know I am treading on a very difficult subject, but I feel confident of this, that we must face it, and that we must face it calmly, justly, and with a willingness to put labor and

the profits of labor second — the moral state and domestic life of the whole working population first. I will not venture to draw up such an act of Parliament further than to lay down this principle. These things (the present condition of the poor in England) cannot go on; these things ought not to go on. The accumulation of wealth in the land, the piling up of wealth like mountains, in the possession of classes or individuals, cannot go on. No commonwealth can rest on such foundations.' (Miscellanies, Vol. 2, p. 81).

"In our country, above all, this social amelioration is the inevitable programme of the future, and the position which the Church should hold towards it is surely obvious. She can certainly not favor the extremes to which the poor multitudes are naturally inclined but, I repeat, she must withhold them from these extremes by the bonds of affection, by the maternal desire which she will manifest for the concession of all that is just and reasonable in their demands, and by the maternal blessing which she will bestow upon every legitimate means for improving the condition of the people.

"6. Now let us consider for a moment the consequences which would inevitably follow from a contrary course — from a course of want of sympathy for the working class, of suspicion for their aims, of ready condemnation for their methods.

"(a) First, there would be the evident danger of the Church's losing in popular estimation, her right to be considered the friend of the people. The logic of the popular heart goes swiftly to its conclusions, and this conclusion would be most pernicious both for the people and for the Church. To lose the heart of the people would be a misfortune for which the friendship of the few rich and powerful would be no compensation.

"(b) There would be a great danger of rendering hostile to the Church the political power of our country, which has openly taken sides with the millions who are demanding justice and the improvement of their condition. The accusation of being un-American — that is to say, alien to our national spirit — is the most powerful weapon which the enemies of the Church can employ against her. It was this cry which aroused the Know-Nothing persecution thirty years ago, and the same would

be used again if the opportunity offered. To appreciate the gravity of this danger it is well to remark that not only are the rights of the working classes loudly proclaimed by each of our two great political parties, but it is not improbable that, in our approaching national elections there will be a candidate for the office of President of the United States as the special representative of the popular complaints and demands.

"Now, to seek to crush by an ecclesiastical condemnation an organization which represents more than 500,000 votes, and which has already so respectable and so universally recognized a place in the political arena, would, to speak frankly, be considered by the American people as not less ridiculous than rash. To alienate from ourselves the friendship of the people would be to run great risk of losing the respect which the Church has won in the estimation of the American nation, and of forfeiting the peace and prosperity which form so admirable a contrast with her condition in some so-called Catholic countries. Angry utterances have not been wanting of late, and it is well that we should act prudently.

"(c) A third danger — and the one which most keenly touches our hearts — is the risk of losing the love of the children of the Church, and of pushing them into an attitude of resistance against their Mother. The world presents no more beautiful spectacle than that of their filial devotion and obedience; but it is well to recognize that, in our age and in our country, obedience cannot be blind. We would greatly deceive ourselves if we expected it. Our Catholic working men sincerely believe that they are only seeking justice, and seeking it by legitimate means. A condemnation would be considered both false and unjust, and, therefore, not binding. We might preach to them submission and confidence in the Church's judgment, but these good dispositions could hardly go so far. They love the Church, and they wish to save their souls, but they must also earn their living, and labor is now so organized that without belonging to the organization it is almost impossible to earn one's living.

"Behold, then, the consequences to be feared. Thousands of the Church's most devoted children, whose affection is her

greatest comfort, and whose free offerings are her chief support, would consider themselves repulsed by their Mother, and would live without practising their religion. Catholics who have hitherto shunned the secret societies, would be sorely tempted to join their ranks. The Holy See, which has constantly received from the Catholics of America proofs of almost unparalleled devotedness, would be considered not as a paternal authority, but as a harsh and unjust power. Surely these are consequences which wisdom and prudence counsel us to avoid.

"7. But, besides the dangers that would result from such a condemnation, and the impracticability of putting it into effect, it is also very important that we should carefully consider another reason against condemnation, arising from the unstable and transient character of the organization in question. It is frequently remarked by the press and by attentive observers that this special form of association has in it so little permanence that, in its present shape, it is not likely to last many years. Whence it follows that it is not necessary, even if it were just and prudent, to level the condemnations of the Church solely against so evanescent an object. The social agitation itself will, indeed, last as long as there are social evils to be remedied; but the forms of organization meant for the attainment of this end are naturally provisional and short-lived. They are also very numerous, for I have already remarked that the Knights of Labor is only one among many labor organizations.

"To strike, then, at one of these forms would be to commence a war without system and without end; it would be to exhaust the forces of the Church in chasing a crowd of changing and uncertain spectres. The American people behold with perfect composure and confidence the progress of our social contest, and have not the least fear of not being able to protect themselves against any excesses or dangers that may occasionally arise. Hence, to speak with the most profound respect, but also with the frankness which duty requires of me, it seems to me that prudence suggests, and that even the dignity of the Church demands that we should not offer to America an ecclesi-

astical protection for which she does not ask, and of which she believes she has no need.

"8. In all this discussion I have not at all spoken of Canada, nor of the condemnation concerning the Knights of Labor in Canada; for we would consider it an impertinence on our part to meddle with the ecclesiastical affairs of another country which has an hierarchy of its own, and with whose social conditions we do not pretend to be acquainted. We believe, however, that the circumstances of a people almost entirely Catholic, as in lower Canada, must be very different from those of a mixed population like ours; moreover, that the documents submitted to the Holy Office are not the present constitution of the organization in our country, and that we, therefore, ask nothing involving an inconsistency on the part of the Holy See, which passed sentence *localiter et juxta exposita*.

"It is of the United States that we speak, and we trust that we are not presumptuous in believing that we are competent to judge about the state of things in our own country. Now, as I have already indicated, out of the seventy-five archbishops and bishops of the United States, there are about five who desire the condemnation of the Knights of Labor, such as they are in our own country; so that our hierarchy are almost unanimous in protesting against such a condemnation. Such a fact ought to have great weight in deciding the question. If there are difficulties in the case, it seems to me that the prudence and experience of our bishops and the wise rules of the Third Plenary Council ought to suffice for their solution.

"Finally, to sum up all, it seems to me that the Holy See could not decide to condemn an association under the following circumstances:

"1. When the condemnation does not seem to be justified either by the letter or the spirit of its constitution, its laws and the declaration of its chief.

"2. When the condemnation does not seem necessary, in view of the transient form of the organization and the social condition of the United States.

"3. When it does not seem to be prudent, because of the reality of the grievances complained of by the working classes, and their acknowledgment by the American people.

"4. When it would be dangerous for the reputation of the Church in our democratic country, and might even lead to persecution.

"5. When it would probably be inefficacious, owing to the general conviction that it would be unjust.

"6. When it would be destructive instead of beneficial in its effects, impelling the children of the Church to disobey their Mother, and even to enter condemned societies, which they have thus far shunned.

"7. When it would turn into suspicion and hostility the singular devotedness of our Catholic people towards the Holy See.

"8. When it would be regarded as a cruel blow to the authority of bishops in the United States, who, it is well known, protest against such a condemnation.

"Now, I hope the considerations here presented have sufficiently shown that such would be the effect of condemnation of the Knights of Labor in the United States.

"Therefore, I leave the decision of the case, with fullest confidence to the wisdom and prudence of your Eminence and the Holy See."

J. CARD. GIBBONS,

Archbishop of Baltimore.

Rome, February 20, 1887.

2. REVIEW OF THE ENCYCLICAL OF POPE LEO XIII ON THE CONDITION OF LABOR¹

BY CARDINAL MANNING

SINCE the Divine words, "I have compassion on the multitude," were spoken in the wilderness, no voice has been heard throughout the world pleading for the people with such profound and loving sympathy for those that toil and suffer as the voice of Leo XIII. This is no rhetorical exaggeration, but strict truth. None but the Vicar of our Divine Lord could so speak to mankind. No Pontiff has ever had such an opportunity so to speak, for never till now has the world of labor been so consciously united, so dependent upon the will of the rich, so opposed to the fluctuations of adversity and to the vicissitudes of trade. Leo XIII looking out of the watch-tower of the Christian world, as St. Leo the Great used to say, has before him what no Pontiff yet has ever seen. He sees all the kingdoms of the world and the sufferings of them.

The moan of discontent, of toil, of sorrow, goes up before him. The modern world, by every agency of knowledge, and by every bond of interest and of intellect, has become confluent. It has one intelligence, one conscience, one will, for it is under one law: "In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread"; and for millions that bread is scant. Its sufferings are the same, and its needs and demands are the same. This interchange of knowledge is so rapid and complete, not only as of old by messengers and by letters, but by the electric wire and instantaneous transit, that the workers and toilers of all languages and all lands are united by one living consciousness and by a continual participation in the various changes of labor and of trade. The world of to-day is a world of enormous wealth and endless labor. The Holy Father, at the outset of the Encyclical, recognizes this character of the nineteenth century. He says that "the growth of industry and the sur-

¹ From the *Dublin Review*, July, 1891.

prising discoveries of science; the changed relations of masters and workmen; the enormous fortunes of individuals and the poverty of the masses; the increased self-reliance and the closer mutual combination of the working population," have created a new condition in the world full of elements of conflict; and this is rendered more menacing by "a general moral deterioration" that is in all classes and in all nations. It is upon such a world that he looks down; and his heart is with the poor; "I have compassion on the multitude"—on the poor, who, as he says, are "the majority of mankind."

"All agree," he says, "and there can be no question whatever that some remedy must be found, and that quickly found, for the misery and wretchedness which press so heavily at this moment on the large majority of the very poor. The ancient workmen's guilds were destroyed in the last century, and no other organization took their place. Hence by degrees it has come to pass that workingmen have been given over, isolated and defenceless, to the callousness of employers and the greed of unrestrained competition. The evil has been increased by rapacious usury, which though more than once condemned by the Church, is nevertheless under a different form, but with the same guilt, still practised by avaricious and grasping men; and to this must be added the custom of working by contract, and the concentration of so many branches of trade in the hands of a few individuals, so that a number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the masses of the poor a yoke little better than slavery itself." This is no new pronouncement of Leo XIII. It is perhaps not *known* to many that the study of this question has long occupied his mind. During his episcopate at Perugia he issued pastorals, even stronger and more explicit, on the sufferings of the workers and the callousness of employers. By a happy providence, what he then wrote in a pastoral to an Umbrian flock, he now promulgates with Apostolic authority to the whole world.

Before we speak of the text of the Encyclical, we must make two preliminary remarks.

Some public critics have censured it for vagueness and generality. They are disappointed because they do not find de-

tailed and particular solutions, remedies, and schemes of action. But they forget that the diversities of nations, in civilization, in maturity, in climate, in character, in the diversities of natural and industrial products, also in mode of life and in a multitude of other conditions and circumstances, make it as impossible to prescribe remedies for all nations as it would be to dispense a score of prescriptions for all the hospitals of Europe. It was of absolute necessity to lay down broad principles which serve as major premises in all arguments of the social order.

The other remark is this: that the Holy Father has lifted Political Economy from the low level of selfishness in profit and loss, labor and wages, and replaced it on the right and true level of Social Economy. The very word economy is a protest against the narrowness of the last hundred years. Economy is the administration of a household. He is a bad householder who attends only to weekly bills, and neglects the health, morals, and welfare of the household. There is nothing needed for the well-being and happiness of the family for which domestic economy does not vigilantly provide. The finances of the household are necessary, but subordinate. They are only details of administration. When we speak of "political" economy we speak in metaphors. A State is metaphorically a family, a household; and metaphorically it has an administration which is to the commonwealth what economy is to the household. It includes every form of material and moral provision for the public health and welfare. In this, finance and commerce are an important but a subordinate part. The Holy Father has carefully defined this economy and its bearing upon Socialism, both the thing and the term, as we shall see hereafter.

The Encyclical divides itself into four parts. The first treats of the origin and constitution of human society. The second shows the unnatural, abnormal, and subversive nature of what is called Socialism. The third treats of the intervention of the State in social questions. The fourth and last treats of the liberty, duties, and co-operation of workers, both men and women. We will follow this order in commenting upon it.

1. As to the origin of human society, it is much to be feared that many will read the Encyclical without weighing its deep and far reaching enunciation of primary truths. Many also will call them truisms and fail to weigh them. For instance:

1. "Man is older than the State, and he holds the right of providing for the life of his body, prior to the formation of any State."

2. "To say that God has given the earth to the use and enjoyment of the universal human race is not to deny that there can be private property."

3. "When man spends the industry of his mind and the strength of his body in procuring the fruits of nature by that act he makes his own that portion of nature's field which he cultivates, that portion on which he leaves, as it were, the *impress of his personality*."

4. "As effects follow their cause, so it is just and right that the results of labor should belong to him who has labored."

5. "With reason therefore the common opinion of mankind. . . . has found, in the study of nature and in the law of nature herself, the foundations of the division of property, and has consecrated by the practice of all ages the principle of private ownership."

6. "That we have the family: the society of a man's own household; a society limited indeed in numbers, but a true 'society' anterior to every State or nation, with rights and duties of its own, totally independent of the commonwealth."

7. "It is a most sacred law of nature that a father must provide food and all necessities for those whom he has begotten. . . . A man's children carry on, as it were, and continue his own personality."

8. "The family has at least equal rights with the State in the choice and pursuit of those things which are needful to its preservation, and to its just liberty."

9. "We say at least equal rights, for since the domestic household is anterior, both in idea and in fact, to the gathering of men into a commonwealth, the former must necessarily have rights and duties which are prior to those of the latter, and which rest more immediately on nature."

10. "The idea, then, that the civil government should, at its own discretion, penetrate and pervade the family and the household is a great and pernicious mistake."

11. "Paternal authority can neither be abolished by the State nor absorbed, for it has the same source as human life itself."

12. "The child . . . is, as it were, the continuation of the father's personality."

13. "To speak with strictness, the child takes its place in civil

society, not in its own right, but in its quality as a member of the family . . . before it attains the use of freewill, it is in the power and care of its parents."

We have thought it best to extract these passages, and to place them in an orderly series, because, embedded in a context full of manifold and various interest, their full force may be easily lost. They are like the axioms of mathematics, the immovable foundations of all reasoning. They are the basis and the constructive lines of human society, which is a Divine creation in the order of nature.

The Encyclical then proceeds to describe Socialism by the doctrines of its first teachers and chief writers. The essence of Socialism, according to this statement, consists in the denial of the natural right of property or of private ownership, and in the assertion that it is lawful to reform and constitute human society on the basis of the universal equality of man, and the community of goods.

2. The Encyclical goes on to show the false and destructive character of Socialism.

The law of property or of private ownership, both in land and in the product of his own labor, is founded in nature, and cannot be abolished by any human authority without a violation of the Divine order of natural society. Neither land nor wage can be nationalized. Property existed before the nation; and rests immediately on nature itself. This does not deny the lawfulness of taxing all property by the State for the safety or welfare of the commonwealth. It denies only the lawfulness of uprooting the right of property which is in its origin founded on nature itself. There are many kinds of nominal Socialism, which we need not deal with now; but of the original Socialism there are two sections: the one that holds the lawfulness of nationalizing both land and the wages of labor; the other that holds the lawfulness of nationalizing the land only, but admits the right of private property in the wages and products of personal labor. The Encyclical denies both these claims. Socialism therefore affects to reconstitute human society upon a new foundation and by new laws, and this, whether accomplished by force or by fallacy, is destructive of the natural and normal

society of man. For this cause the terms Socialistic and Socialism have an essentially ill signification. Socialism is to society what rationalism is to reasoning. It denotes an abuse, an excess, a de-ordination in human society, as rationalism denotes a misuse and an abuse of reason. All reasoning must be rational that is in conformity with the laws of reason, and all legislation for human society must be both human and social by the necessity and nature of mankind. Inhuman and anti-social law is not law, but tyranny or anarchy. It implies therefore a laxity of thought, or at least of terminology, to speak of Christian Socialism, of Catholic Socialism. The Holy Father is too keen in his apprehension and too exact in his reasoning to admit such confusion even in terms. This will be seen in the third part of the Encyclical, which treats of the intervention of the State in social questions.

Leo XIII points out that the equality of all men is contradicted by every fact and condition of human life. Both the gifts of nature and the products of human freewill introduce, at every moment, inequalities which are lawful, innocent, and fruitful of every kind of good. Society itself would not grow, nor would its prosperity and power be developed, if all men were equal. And as society unfolds its own perfections, men at once become unequal. The inequalities of age alone would daily multiply the inequalities of early and middle and mature life. If we were all equal to-day, inequalities would spring up to-morrow. And these very inequalities are the spirit and the means of growing perfection. "It is impossible to reduce human society to a level. The Socialists may do their utmost, but they are striving against nature in vain."

If the right of private ownership were violated, no one would suffer so much as the poor working-man. It is his ambition and his prayer to possess as his own the roof over his head and the patch of garden which now pays his rent. In absorbing rich landlords, the poor cottager is also sacrificed. Property is more vital to those who have little than to those who have much. The rich may make great losses, and yet have enough to live; but they who live always on the brink of want, are ruined by one privation.

Socialism properly so-called, by the equality of all and the community of goods invades also the domestic life and the rights of parents. "The Socialists therefore in setting aside the parent, and introducing the providence of the State, act *against natural justice*, and therefore the very existence of family life."

The Holy Father goes on to point out the remedy of these social evils. He says: "There is nothing more useful than to look at the world as it is, and at the same time to look elsewhere for a remedy to its troubles." It is certain that the world cannot heal itself; it is more certain that Socialism, which violates the primary laws of nature, cannot heal our social evils. Socialism is in itself the master evil in the society of men, being the destroyer of the first laws of the natural order. Therefore, to find a remedy we are bid to look away from the world, and to look "elsewhere." It is certain, therefore, that neither legislation, nor civilization, nor any simple human influence or natural agency, can restore society which is sick with manifold diseases. The Holy Father tells us where to look. He says: "When a society is perishing, the true advice to give to those who would restore, is to recall it to the purpose and principles from which it sprang." "So that to fall away from its primal constitution is disease; to go back to it is recovery." "If society is to be cured now, in no other way can it be cured but by a return to the Christian life, and to the Christian institutions." Therefore, "no practical solution of this question will ever be found without the assistance of religion and of the Church." God created the Church and the Church created the Christian world. For three centuries the world has been in revolt against the Church, and has thrown off the first principles from which it sprang; they are: faith, indissoluble matrimony, Christian education, obedience to the Head of the Christian world. The consequence of this revolt is schism, divorce, schools without religion, and the weakening of all moral laws. The natural society of man fell from its normal state into manifold corruptions. The merely human civilization in its most refined state in Greece, and in its loftiest attainments in the Roman world, perished by its own suicidal corruptions. "There cannot be the shadow of doubt . . . that

civil society was renovated in every part by the teaching of Christianity; that in the strength of that renewal the human race was lifted up to better things; nay, that it was brought back from death to life." "Of this beneficent transformation Jesus Christ was at once the first cause and the final purpose; as from Him all came, so to Him all was to be referred."

These sentences are full of meaning. They affirm:

1. That into the fallen and perverted society of men a new life and a new legislation entered, which expelled the evils of human corruption and elevated society to a supernatural state; in other words, that the society and law of nature were not only restored to their first principles, but were elevated to a higher law and state. Human society was made perfect in the supernatural society that is in the Church. Separation therefore from the Church has deprived a great part of the Christian world of its supernatural perfection in life and constitution.

2. That the Christian law made perfect the natural law of justice any mercy, which may be enforced by human tribunals.

3. That it superadded the law of charity, the highest and most perfect law which, though it cannot be enforced by human tribunals, has a Divine sanction to enforce it in the conscience of all men.

4. That without the teaching of Christianity, the moral relations of human society become unsympathetic, hard, and selfish.

When, then, Leo XIII says that the only remedy for the social evils of States is to be found in the Church, he means that "without God there is no society"; without a legislator, human laws are powerless to restrain the selfish passion of men; and without charity all laws are cold, unpersuasive, and inefficacious. Justice alone without mercy is heartless, and mercy without charity is constrained and repulsive. Without the Church, this higher moral law is not to be found. The condition of the labor world, or of the "labor market," as political economists have taught us to call it, is proof enough.

The Encyclical then points out two other explicit reasons why the actions of the Church, in its teaching, spirit and sanction, is of the highest moment to society, and especially to

the millions of the world. The poor are the special charge of the Church. "God hath chosen the poor of this world." "Hearken, my beloved brethren, hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which God hath promised to them that love Him?" Every living soul is in His immediate care, the rich as well as the poor; there is no distinction of class or privilege with Him. Every soul, whether refined or rude, is in His keeping. But with an especial care He watches over those who "eat bread in the sweat of their brow." They are under the habitual penance of Adam in privation, toil, poverty, often in want, living in hardness, and bearing many sufferings. They live perpetually on the brink of want, in the midst of vicissitudes of human fortune. None needs the Paraclete, the Consoler, more than they; and none needs the sympathy of the Church as they do. "The Church has guarded with religious care the inheritance of the poor." At the present day there are many who, like the heathen of old, condemn the Church for this beautiful charity. We are told that it demoralizes the people. "They would substitute in its place a system of State organized relief. But no human methods will ever supply for the devotion and self-sacrifice of Christian charity."

Another reason is this. The creative power of the Church has in all ages formed for itself organized bodies, incorporating and fulfilling its manifold works of charity. A religious order springs from the bosom of the Church, and is sustained by it. And as religious orders have sprung up within it, so also have guilds, confraternities, sadalities, unions, both sacred and beneficial. Association and co-operation are of the spirit of brotherhood; and the greatest brotherhood in the world is the Church itself. Therefore the Church blesses and encourages every form of lawful and Christian association. It condemns secret societies as such, because they walk in darkness; but it sanctions the open uniting of men for a lawful object, such as mutual protection against those who make the largest profits out of the lowest wages, or intolerable hours of work, and the like. In a word, the Church recognizes the liberty of the human will in all its lawful actions, individual and collective;

and it encourages men to use that liberty for their self-defence and for the defence and help of others.

But finally, the Church alone deals not only with the bodily, but also with the spiritual life of man; and no people can be peaceful or contented with a life of labor who do not know, and hope for, an eternal rest. And it thereby teaches men, the poorest and the humblest, their true dignity. "No man may outrage with impunity that human dignity which God Himself treats with reverence; nor stand in the way of that higher life which is the preparation for the eternal life of heaven." It is certain that in the measure in which these truths pervade the mind of people, in that measure they are elevated, refined, and independent. In the measure in which they are lost, a people becomes animal, gross and intractable, or, it may be, slavish. "To consent to any treatment which is calculated to defeat the end and purpose of his being, is beyond his right. He cannot give up his soul to servitude; for it is not man's own rights which are here in question, but the rights of God." "Therefore no man can contract to work so many hours and so many days a week as to render it impossible for him to live a Christian and human life." From this follows the obligation of the cessation of work and labor on Sundays and certain festivals. From this also it follows that to work sixteen or eighteen hours a day is contrary both to natural and to Christian law. It springs either from the recklessness of the employed, or the covetousness of the employer. This is a just condemnation of the state of many of our industries, under which till now our people have suffered in silence. But they are now bid to make their burdens and sufferings known.

3. The Encyclical then treats of the intervention of the State in matters of political economy. If a century of narrow and commercial mistreatment had not contracted the range and fulness of political economy to the "dismal science" of supply and demand, wage-funds and labor markets, the very title would have affirmed the duty of the State to intervene whenever the welfare of the commonwealth is in any part at stake. All political economy contains financial and commercial economy, but neither commerce nor finance are co-extensive with political economy. Political economy watches

indeed over the whole commercial and financial economy, but it watches also over the welfare of all classes. Classes revolve round their own interests. It is in reaction from this organized selfishness that some men have recoiled into Socialism. The Encyclical having carefully defined Socialism, both name and thing, goes on to show how the legislation of human society must be essentially social. "It is in the power of a ruler to benefit every order of the State, and among the rest to promote in the highest degree the interests of the poor; . . . for it is the province of the commonwealth to consult for the common good, and the more that is done for the working population by the general laws of the country, the less need will there be to seek for particular means to relieve them."

"The richer population have many ways of protecting themselves, and stand less in need of help from the State. Those who are badly off have no recourse of their own to fall back upon, and must chiefly rely upon the assistance of the State, and it is for this reason that wage-earners, who are undoubtedly among the weak and necessitous, should be especially cared for and protected by the commonwealth." It is to be doubted whether in any country of the Christian world these truths are better realized than in our own. Ever since the abolition of slavery in 1834, our legislation has entered more and more minutely into the social needs and sufferings of our people. Our poor-law incorporates the primary laws of nature, that a man has a right to live and a right to the food necessary to sustain life, either by gift or by wage. But nobody dreams of calling these laws socialistic. The mining and factory legislation protects millions of men, women and children; the abolition of Corn Laws impoverished a class for the welfare of the people; a dozen laws protect children from noxious trades and the like; but no man till now has been blind enough to accuse our Statute-Book of Socialism. The State educations of France, America and Belgium are denounced as godless; but though they are the worst form of Socialism, nobody says so or sees it. But if any man would protect the world of labor from the oppression of "free contracts" or "starvation wages," he is a Socialist. So obscure from want of thought, or so warped by interest, or so prejudiced by class feeling are the

minds of men. Our legislation hitherto and the programme of the Berlin Conference are supremely conservative, social, and anti-socialistic.

4. The Encyclical comes lastly to the liberty, duties, and co-operation of workers. The treatment of this is paternal in its compassion and minute in its detail. It shows both the heart and the head of the Good Shepherd. First, as to liberty. Work is the condition of bread. But in the choice of the kind of work, the master for whom, the wages for which a man shall work, all this rests with himself. The employer has the dead capital of gold and silver. The workman has the living capital of strength and skill. If strength and skill are unproductive without gold and silver, gold and silver are dead without strength and skill. A free and faithful contract between them is necessary for the productiveness of both. A man has a right and an absolute liberty to work for such wages as he thinks just; to refuse to work for less. Men have both right and liberty to unite with others of the same trade or craft, and to demand a just wage for their labor. If this just wage is refused, they have both right and liberty to refuse to work — that is, to strike. Leo XIII fully recognizes this liberty. So long as the cause is right, the right to strike is undeniable. He “is free to work or not.”

But next arises the question, What is a just wage? The Encyclical has given a very explicit and definite answer. It is impossible to define the maximum. It is only necessary to define the minimum. The Encyclical says: “Let it be granted then, that, as a rule, workmen and employer should make free agreements, and in particular should freely agree as to wages; nevertheless there is a dictate of nature, more imperious and more ancient than any bargain between man and man, that the remuneration must be enough to support the wage-earner in reasonable and frugal comfort.” This is immediately further explained as, “sufficient to enable him to maintain himself, his wife, and his children.”

We have here the measure of the minimum wage. It must be sufficient to maintain a man and his home. This does not mean a variable measure, or a sliding scale according to the number of children, but a fixed average sum. “If through

necessity or fear of worse evil the workman accepts harder conditions because an employer or contractor will give him no better, he is the victim of force and injustice." The foundation of this judgment is in the law of nature. It is clear that the normal state of man in the natural order is that every man should have and should dwell in his own home, surrounded by the duties and charities of life. If the civil population of the country were debarred from marriage, like the standing army, the face of the country would be visited with all the evils of a garrison town. Homeless men are reckless. There would be but little patriotism in a country where no man cares to stand *pro aris et focis*. The hearth-money of our forefathers was the sure pledge of their loyalty. The policy of the law — that is, its aim and spirit — is that homeless men be few, and that the homes of the people be the broad and solid foundation on which the commonwealth, in all its social and political life, shall repose. We may therefore take the maintenance of a home as a minimum of a just wage.

It follows, therefore, that an employer who should take single men without homes at a lower wage would commit a social injustice, full of immoral and dangerous consequences to society.

Beyond this it is impossible to go. Every kind of industry and of labor, skilled and unskilled, in all the diversities of toil or danger, will have its special claims; but the lowest line is the worker and his home.

It is well to bear in mind that the oldest free contract between landowner and laborer is the *metayer* system, by which the annual produce of the soil is halved between the landlord and the producer. This still exists abroad. It bears witness to a law of proportion which is just, and it is a source of contentment and good will. Where there is no proportion, or known proportion, between enormous and increasing wealth and scanty and stationary wages, to be contented is to be super-human. Leo XIII without naming any one, warmly commends the works of those in France and elsewhere who are giving to their workmen a share in the profits and prosperity of their commerce and industry.

On the liberty of strike, Leo XIII is equally explicit.

"When work-people have recourse to a strike, it is frequently because the hours of labor are too long, or the work too hard, or because they consider their wages insufficient."

"Such paralysis of labor not only affects the masters and their work-people, but is extremely injurious to trade and to the general interests of the public." A strike is like war. If for a just cause, a strike is right and inevitable; it is a healthful constraint imposed upon the despotism of capital. It is the only power in the hands of working men. We have been for years blinded or dazed by the phrases of "free contract," "the independence of adult labor," "free labor," and the like. The meaning is this: Let working men maintain their independence of one another, and of all associations, and of all unions, and of all united action, and of all intervention of law in their behalf. The more perfectly they are isolated, the more independent of all defenders, the more dependent they are on capitalists. Starving men may be locked out with impunity. The hunger of their wives, the cries of their children, their own want of food will compel them to come in. It is evident that between a capitalist and a working man there can be no true freedom of contract. The capitalist is invulnerable in his wealth. The working man without bread has no choice but either to agree or to hunger in his hungry home. For this cause "freedom of contract" has been the gospel of employers; and they have resented hotly any intervention of any peacemaker. They have claimed that no one can come between them and their men; that their relation to them is a private, almost a domestic affair. They forget that when thousands of women and children suffer while they are refusing to grant a penny more in wages, or an hour less in work, there is a wide field of misery caused by their refusal, which prolongs a strike. It is then no private affair, but a public evil which excites the public condemnation. And more than this—a handful of miserable men harshly treated grows to a mob, and a mob soon grows to a multitude, and a multitude soon grows beyond its own control, and when batoned by police and angered by the ostentatious presence of soldiers, horse and foot, breaks into flight and scours the streets, wrecking, robbing, and looting, without aim or reason. Again, as more recently, for a month the streets of London were choked

day by day with processions of tens of thousands. Disorder, and horse play, which at any moment might turn to collisions with the people or the police, were imminent; these were sharpened by disappointment, and irritated by refusal of an additional penny an hour. At any moment a drunkard, or a madman, or a fool, might have set fire to the docks and warehouses. The commercial wealth of London and the merchandise of the world, the banks and wharves of the Thames, might have been pillaged; and the conflagration might have spread for hours before order, at unimaginable loss, could be restored. And all this because a strike is "a matter between us and our men." They were reminded that there were two other parties interested between masters and men, the multitude of suffering women and children, and the whole peaceful population of London. At a certain stage of such a conflict, either or both of these parties have a social, civic, and natural right to intervene to protect the public safety. Leo XIII in such cases goes beyond the intervention of peacemakers in a voluntary effort to reconcile contending parties. He affirms that the State may intervene. "If," he says, "by a strike or other combination of workmen, there should be imminent danger of disturbance to the public peace, or if circumstances were such that among the laboring population the ties of family life were relaxed . . . finally, if health were endangered by excessive labor, or by work unsuited to sex or age, in these cases there can be no question that within certain limits it would be right to call in the help and authority of the law." So little does the Encyclical recognize the absolutism of employers, and so fully does it justify the action of Parliament in the Commission on Sweating, in the Commission on the Hours of Labor, and now in the Commission of Labor in all its relations to Capital. Leo XIII gives to legislators a supreme counsel:

"The laws should be beforehand and prevent these troubles from arising, they should lend their influence and authority to the removal in good time of the causes which tend to conflicts between masters and those whom they employ."

This, as he especially urges, ought to be provided for by voluntary tribunals of arbitration, composed of employers and employed in their respective unions or associations; and when

no such provisions of previous legislation exist, if Parliament is not assembled and danger is urgent, it is the right and the duty of every loyal man, who loves his country and his people, at any cost or danger to himself, to come between the parties in conflict, and to bring them, if he can, to peace.

The Encyclical then, in a few sympathetic words, treats of the employment of women and children. Of women it says: "They are not suited to certain trades: for woman is by nature fitted for home work, and it is that which is best adapted at once to preserve her modesty, and to promote the good bringing-up of children and the well-being of the family." As we read these words, the chainmakers of Cradley Heath, the pit-brow women of the mines, and the mothers in our factories rise before us. Here is a moral case to be solved. A woman enters for life into a sacred contract with a man before God and the altar, to fulfill to him the duties of wife, mother, and head of his home. Is it lawful for her, even with his consent, to make afterwards a second contract for so many shillings a week with a mill owner, whereby she becomes unable to provide her husband's food, train up her children, or do the duties of her home? It is no question of the lawfulness of gaining a few more shillings for the expenses of a family, but of the lawfulness of breaking a prior contract—the most solemn between man and woman. No arguments of expediency can be admitted. It is an obligation of conscience to which all things must give way. The duties of home must first be done, then other questions may be entertained. Till then nothing. Some people seem to think that our statute law is of high perfection, because it forbids mothers to return to work for three weeks or a month after childbirth. By a higher law, the law of nature, the whole care and time of the mother is due to the child; a mother's instincts ought to prevail over all lower motives. There can be no home where a mother does not nurture her own infant; and where there is no home, there is no domestic life, and where the domestic life of a people is undermined, their social and political life rests on sand. To this it will be answered: that without the mother's earnings the children would not be fed. To this there are many answers. The minimum of wages would suffice, if the relations of capital and labor were

even just; much more, if generous. Already men have complained that employers prefer the cheaper work of women, and women are finding that employers prefer the cheaper work of children. It is the old formula of modern political economy, "sell in the dearest market, and buy in the cheapest." What is cheaper than the work of women and half-timers? A normal state of wage earning would put back every wife into her home in the midst of her children.

Finally, the Encyclical speaks in few but comprehensive words of the labor of children. "In regard to children, great care should be taken not to place them in workshops and factories until their bodies and minds are sufficiently mature. For just as rough weather destroys the buds of spring, so too early an experience of life's hard work blights the young promise of a child's powers, and makes any real education impossible." There is a tenderness and wisdom in these words which makes all comment needless. Indeed, they exhaust the subject. The condition of child-labor fifty years ago cannot now be conceived by those who have only seen the half-timers of Lancashire and Yorkshire. Children hardly out of infancy were then overcrowded in rooms, ill-ventilated, the air of which became poisonous. They were set to picking cotton and other like materials, of which the filaments and the fluff affected the organs of respiration. Our Legislature very tardily and after long contention made such child-labor unlawful. Names of political history are to be found resisting every advance of this humane legislation. They prophesied the ruin of our manufacturers if the labor of infants were forbidden, as men are prophesying now the downfall of our commerce if we save the half-timers from the premature toil which mars their education, exhausts their health, and checks the normal development of body and of brain. All the chief Powers of Europe, and many of the lesser States, agreed at Berlin to raise the minimum age for child-labor to twelve years. Many have done it: some have raised it to thirteen. We voted, and therefore pledged our honor and our humanity, to raise the minimum age to twelve. We have not done it. Our rulers have refused to do it. With a niggard will we are raising it after a year's delay to eleven. The words of Leo XIII will sear us till we raise it at least to twelve.

Such then in outline is the teaching of Leo XIII. We have, at the risk of breaking the continuity of narrative, given the very words of the Encyclical, arranging them in the main order of the subject-matter as to human society and its morbid parasite of Socialism; as to the Church, the supernatural Society, and the salvation of the political order of the world; as to the State in its relation to the world of labor; and finally, as to the workers, their liberty and their homes.

The Voice of the Good Shepherd has been heard by the flock spread throughout the world with a loving, thankful, and joyous assent. It has been heard by sovereigns and statesmen, and men of every calling and of every measure of culture, with a respectful attention never before given to any Pontifical utterance. It has been heard by the millions of the world of labor, and they have recognized the accents of the Father's love and sympathy. In truth, the Encyclical, both in matter and in manner of treatment, comes home to the intelligence and heart of this day with the simplicity of a household world. Who does not know what labor is? And who is not a sharer in its interests or sympathies or sufferings? Now, there is only one person who represents two things which men think irreconcilable — power and poverty; the Vicar of our Lord "who, though he was rich, yet for our sakes became poor," — he only knows both and can speak to both as a partaker in both.

For a century the civil Powers in almost all the Christian world have been separating themselves from the Church, claiming and glorying in their separation. They have set up the State as a purely lay and secular society, and have thrust the Church from them. And now of a sudden they find that the millions of the world sympathize with the Church, which has compassion on the multitude, rather than with the State, or the plutocracy which has weighed so heavily upon them.

3. PASTORAL LETTER ON THE LABORER'S RIGHTS

BY CARDINAL O'CONNELL, ARCHBISHOP OF BOSTON

THE time of Advent set apart by the Church to prepare the minds of men for the coming of the Prince of Peace seems an appropriate one, Venerable Brethren of the clergy and laity, to open my pastoral heart to you on a subject vitally connected with your domestic, civil and spiritual peace.

The social problem of the relations between employers and employed appears to be the one most fraught with danger to our peaceful living. It has been many times in the past the source of widespread discord and disorder, and may in the future prove a danger to the public peace unless some remedy can be found to better our social conditions. The hostile attitude of one set of men against another is always prejudicial to the permanence of peaceful relations; but when two classes are arrayed in antagonism and distrust, each against the other, the one with the resources of wealth and power behind it, the other with the force of numbers to make its influence felt, society is menaced by impending outbreaks, and the peace of families, the tranquillity of the State and the normal calm engendered by religion are imperiled.

To find a way out of these social dangers, to reconcile conflicting interests, to lay down a basis for the just and equitable settlement of differences between employers and workers is a call to an apostolate of the highest service, which every lover of his faith and of his country should heed, and to which every Christian and every patriot may well consecrate his best endeavors.

Justice and charity, two of the noblest Christian virtues, hold a foremost place in any genuine crusade for social betterment, and make the cause a holy one that appeals even more strongly to the churchman than to the statesman.

The proper consideration of the problem depends much on the way in which we approach it. The initial mistake that is made in trying to find a solution is in viewing the question as a merely economic one. The lives and happiness of millions of human beings are involved in the issue; and this gives it a moral aspect which cannot be ignored. It is much more than an economic problem. From the moment that the well-being of individuals and families is concerned in any question at issue, it is lifted out of the domain of mere economics. Bald political economy, with its inflexible law of supply and demand, can no longer cope with it. The reciprocal rights and duties inhering in the personality and position of those who are making claims and of those who are resisting them, enter in and create at once a moral issue. In the long run dollars and cents are powerless before a just human right, and must give way in every community ruled by principles of justice.

The question of human rights that is involved in the issue between capital and labor goes deeper down than any legal enactment concerning them. In fact, much of the confusion of thought surrounding the problem springs from a faulty conception of the fundamental sources of human society. There is a tendency to-day to exalt unduly the State, and to regard it as the creator of all the rights and privileges which we enjoy, and to look to it for the solution of all our problems. Such a position is philosophically and historically false. The family is, by nature and in fact, anterior to the State. There are certain inherent individual and family rights that spring from nature itself and from the fundamental relations established by the Creator in the universe which antedate the constitution of States or the enactments of civil law. The authority of the parent over his child, his right to provide for his family, the choice of the kind of education his children shall receive — all these fundamental rights are rooted in the very nature of family life. So also the rights of conscience are inherent in the individual. They were not created by the State. They are anterior to it by nature and in fact. But if the State is not the creator of them, the State should be the conserver and respecter of them. For it was precisely to safeguard these primary rights of the individual and of the family that States

were formed. To the fact that man is by nature a social being, made so by his Creator, and to the natural need of individuals and families of protecting their primary and natural rights, which alone and isolated they had not the strength to defend against unjust aggression, States owe their origin and formation. It is the province of the State in consonance with its origin to protect those fundamental, individual and family rights, not to invade them

Now, the right of a man to provide for his family is a natural one. In the exercise of this right he may sell his labor for what he considers just compensation, or may refuse his labor for what he deems an inadequate return. The measure which he must use in determining his decision is that imposed by nature itself. He must support his family; and the living wage which he has a right to demand according to the teaching of Leo XIII, of blessed memory, is the one which will maintain his family in decent and frugal comfort. The man who accepts less through necessity or fear of harder conditions is the victim of force and injustice. This general norm of wage does not exclude the special claims of labor, skilled and unskilled, which according to the degree of toil or danger incurred has a right to greater compensation. It simply means that the lowest measure of compensation must be the decent maintenance of a man and his home.

This principle is based on sound political economy and the highest political wisdom. The safety of the State depends upon the integrity of its homes. To build up contented homes should be the aim of enlightened legislation as well as the scope of every movement for social betterment. The source of the nation's strength lies in the stable and well-ordered home, and without it national greatness swiftly hastens to decay. The homeless man, free from the restraints of domestic life, may easily become a menace, and to diminish such a danger becomes the duty of comprehensive patriotic statesmanship.

The maintenance of a home, then, is the minimum wage dictated by the law of nature, and prompted by the highest public policy. It is the clear right of the wage-earner, and to protect this right he may make use of all legitimate means. He may combine with others to enforce it and form a union with his fel-

low-workers to exert the adequate moral power to maintain it or to better his condition within the limits of justice. To deny him this right is a tyranny and an injustice. He has no other way to safeguard his interests. The rich and the powerful have many ways which they do not hesitate to employ to protect their investments; the working man has only the support of peaceful combination.

Moreover, workmen's associations may peacefully agitate and seek to mold public opinion in their favor to bring about a redress of real grievances. A campaign of this kind must, however, be legitimately conducted, free from violations of justice and of charity and of the public peace. Finally, the worker, in the last resort, has the right to refuse to work, that is to strike, and to induce by peaceful and lawful methods others to strike with him, when this extreme measure becomes necessary to mitigate unendurable conditions, or to wrest from an unreasonable employer just compensation for his labor, after all other measures have failed.

All this is the teaching of the illustrious Pontiff Leo XIII, in his now famous encyclical "On the Condition of the Workingmen." It has its root in the law of nature, which dictates that a man has a natural right to a wage which will maintain his home in frugal and reasonable comfort. All the other conclusions which we have laid down are but corollaries flowing from this fundamental principle, on the ground that anyone who possesses a natural right may make use of all legitimate means to protect it, and to safeguard it from violation.

These are the objective principles which may serve as guiding ones in contests between workers and employers, and if loyally accepted by both sides would undoubtedly mitigate the bitterness that often arises in labor disputes.

The principles governing the conduct of employers are well known, and are generally accepted as the only safe ones which may be followed. They may be summed up as follows: Capital has a right to a just share of the profits, but only to a just share. Employers should treat those who work under them with humanity and justice; they should be solicitous for the healthful conditions of the places where workmen daily toil; they should use all reasonable means to promote the material and

moral well-being of their employees. They should be kindly, humane and just in all their relations with them.

We are well aware that some of these principles find no place in a political and commercial economy which has become wholly pagan. We are convinced, however, that the social problem of the relations between employers and workers can never be settled on any other than a Christian basis. The attitude of each towards the other must radically change round to a Christian one, else we shall have the spectacle of two opposing forces facing each other in a hostile spirit, each stubbornly insisting on its pound of flesh, with no thought of the Christian brotherhood which ought to bind them together.

The present deplorable situation in the world of labor has been brought about by neglect of Christian principles, and by the attempt to put this question on a material basis only. On the other hand, riches and power bring danger in their train unless moral rectitude and moral standards are accepted as guiding sign posts along the way of life. Money gives power, and it may be sought after too anxiously without due regard to the principles of justice.

St. Paul has declared in the sixth chapter of his first epistle to Timothy that "the desire of money is the root of all evil," meaning, of course, its inordinate and greedy desire. Men are forgetting these principles. They are making too much of money for money's sake. They have forgotten the injunction of the Saviour given in the twelfth chapter of St. Luke: "Take heed and beware of all covetousness; for a man's life doth not consist in the abundance of things which he possesseth." There is need of this solemn warning.

Men with money should be careful to regard it as a means to do good rather than an end. They should beware lest its possession make them arrogant, tyrannical and despisers of their less fortunate brethren. The great restraining force against these natural tendencies is the spirit of religion, which subdues while it strengthens, and sanctifies while it chastens. Whether as individuals or as members of corporate bodies, men of wealth must remember that the Christian law obliges them in one capacity as in the other. There is no double moral standard, no loophole of escape from the sanctions which the

moral law of Christ imposes. Men of wealth should not buy that which is not sellable according to Christian ethics. It is an abuse of their wealth and an infraction of the moral code, and a crime against society.

The merely natural outlook has produced another idea of wealth which is a source of danger. Men regard themselves as absolute owners of what they possess, and claim the right to do with it what they please. In one sense this is true. They are owners, and exclusive owners. But there is a law higher than themselves, and there is a God above them. To stand stubbornly upon individual ground and because they are owners to absolve themselves from all obligations to society and their weaker brethren, is paganism pure and simple. In reality they are, according to the Divine Word, stewards of God. The greater their wealth, the greater their responsibilities.

Before the so-called Reformation this was the Christian conception of wealth, as anyone who will read the records of history will readily see. There was poverty, but no pauperism. The rich man saw in the poor his brethren in Jesus Christ, and was well content to share his treasures on earth, that he might lay up for himself treasures in heaven.

The individualistic principle of life was introduced by the revolt against the authority of the Church. The unity of faith was broken and Christendom ceased to be one great organic social body, one brotherhood in Christ. Once granted the principle that man can choose, as he would a garment, his own religion, the most supreme issue of life, the way is open for him to have his own way in things of all moral import. The direct tendency of the spirit of individualism is to breed self-sufficiency and selfishness. That it does not always do so is owing solely to the fact that it is not always carried out to its logical outcome.

There is need of a return to old Catholic ideals. Men must learn to give to every cause of religion and charity and mutual help, in proportion to their means. Rich men should bear in mind that they shall one day hear the voice of the Master of all saying, "Render an account of thy stewardship." There must be a generous recognition, on the part of those whom God has blessed with abundance, of their obligations to society and

the poorer members of the human family. The Christian spirit must be enkindled in the soul, and this will of itself arouse the noble and generous disposition to approach conflicts with a calm and balanced mind, and with a readiness to listen to higher impulses than the mere desire for victory over helpless and oftentimes maddened men, who, alas, too often have good reason to believe that the rich have lost all sense of kindly feeling and think only of themselves.

On the other hand, workers are just as much bound by the Christian law as their employers. This fact seems to be lost sight of at times, and men give way to their baser impulses. The spirit of envy generates discontent, and the attitude of the laborer towards his employer becomes un-Christian and pagan. There is a disposition, too, to regard work as an intolerable burden to be gotten rid of as soon as possible, and with as little effort as possible. This is contrary to Christian teaching. The Wise Man in Ecclesiastes, who had tasted all the pleasures of life, was forced to confess: "For I have found that there is nothing better for a man than to rejoice in his work." This natural discontent is fomented and intensified by the noisy agitators of Socialism, the enemies of God and man, who would overturn the foundations upon which human society is built, and exile God from His universe.

This singular set of men, who seek to conceal the malice of their real principles, but who cannot, are a brood of disturbers. Their doctrines are an abomination striking at the foundations of family life and religion. Their spirit is not new. A similar class of men were graphically described by St. Paul, in his second epistle to the Thessalonians: "For also when we were with you, this we declared unto you: that if any man shall not work, neither let him eat. For we have heard there are some among you who walk disorderly, working not at all, but curiously meddling. Now we charge them that are such, and beseech them by the Lord Jesus Christ, that working with silence, they would eat their own bread."

There is not, and cannot be a Catholic Socialist. Leo XIII has rejected such a fellowship in his immortal encyclical. The principles of Socialism are utterly opposed to the principles of Christianity. They are mutually destructive of each other.

Certain misguided Christians may call themselves Socialists, but objectively, a Catholic Socialist is an utter impossibility.

Another source of unrest among working people, and one against which they must be warned, is the desire to give themselves over too much to the pleasures of life. It is directly contrary to the Christian, Catholic spirit. It leads people to live beyond their incomes, and is the fruitful source of family troubles and discontent with one's station of life. A Christian people should ever remember that the Christian life is one of restraint. Legitimate recreations are good, but not the surrender of the heart to the pleasures of this life. They should bear in mind the warning of St. Paul, that among those who make dangerous times in the history of the world are "lovers more of pleasures than of God." More economy at home and less perpetual seeking of empty pleasure would remove much of the unnecessary discontent and murmuring which, even without real cause, we hear on many sides.

The social problem of the relations between employers and workers must be solved on a Christian basis, or not at all. They must face each other in the proper frame of mind springing from a Christian spirit, before even an initial step toward permanent betterment can be effected. Employers and workers must regard each other as brothers in the same great brotherhood of Christ. The Church by her teaching inculcates the only sure method of social regeneration. She would purify the hearts of men of selfishness, greed, envy and hatred, which stand in the way of a better understanding. She abolished slavery, in spite of opposition coming from human interests, and made men socially free. She protected and fostered the workingmen's guilds of the Middle Ages, using every means in her power to keep the workers under the gracious and mellowing influence of religion. She alone can be the regenerator of the social commonwealth in the conditions which confront us to-day.

When the worker imbibing her spirit will look upon labor as a conscientious duty to be done with care and diligence, and when the employer accepting her teaching will be content with reasonable profit and treat the laborer generously and hu-

manely, the battle will be already won, and peace will descend and bless both for their loyal Christian and Catholic spirit.

We exhort all, both employers and workmen, to enter upon this holy crusade of Christian emulation, to make every effort for a lasting peace, to shut out from their ranks Socialistic disturbers, to be loyal adherents to the Church, faithfully following and carrying out in their daily lives the teachings of the illustrious Leo, that, human passion laid aside and put out of the lives of the Church's children, the Prince of Peace may reign over a tranquil and contented people.

Let the Societies of the Holy Name, now so well established and so flourishing throughout this diocese, serve as the great spiritual centres whence shall radiate this spirit of religious, domestic and social peace and harmony. Let the doctrines of the Church and the principles of her Pontiffs and Bishops, elucidating the economic conditions of her children and their corresponding duties, be studied and learned well at the meetings of this Confraternity.

When our people have begun to understand better the malice of those who, under the cover of friendship, stir up strife, and when they realize that the law of Christ alone can make them all free, and that not dollars, but peace and contentment, are the richest and most precious possessions in life, then will the clamor of these noisy hawkers of poisonous social panaceas appear what it is in very truth, the vicious propaganda of enemies of the Christian faith, and deceitful disturbers of the peace of States.

During the Holy Season of Advent we charge those having care of souls to instruct their people in the true doctrine of the Church concerning their duties in the realm of labor; to proclaim again to the workman that the consolations which religion holds out to him are the only real and lasting foundations of true happiness below; and that the envy, the jealousy and hatred of class only render 'more and more bitter the contest which, even were it victorious, would end only in the ashes of disillusionment.

Let them announce fearlessly to the rich the duties of their station, and the responsibility of their stewardship. Let them

be courageous and stand, as the Church has ever stood, as the defender of the weak, the poor and the oppressed, warning them, however, of their solemn duty and just obligations.

So may these days be sacredly employed to bring about that peace to men of good will, which the Christ Child came to establish on earth when the first Christmas dawned over Bethlehem.

May the Blessed Saviour and Redeemer of men send among us, during these days of preparation, the fire of His Holy love, that its glow and warmth may cast out the darkness of false doctrines and the chill of un-Christian distrust and unfriendliness, so that we may all, rich and poor, employer and employed, gather around the crib of the Divine Child with Mary and Joseph to adore our God, Whose first law is that of light and love. And may the blessings of God be with you always.

Given at Boston, on the Feast of St. Clement, November 23d, 1912.

4. PASTORAL LETTER ON CATHOLICS AND SOCIAL REFORM

BY CARDINAL BOURNE, ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

THE first appeal for a post-war Catholic reconstruction of the social order, heard the world over, was the ringing message of Cardinal Bourne, sent out in the early part of the year 1918, months before the end of the gigantic struggle of the nations. The words of the English Prelate, written with the history and conditions of his own country primarily in mind, are filled with wise counsel, encouragement and inspiration for all. Their bold and pregnant statements recalled, at the time, the pronouncements of another great churchman who had occupied the same official position, as Archbishop of Westminster, the famous Cardinal Manning. To this the editor of the London *Month* felicitously alluded in a passage which may here best serve our purpose of introduction. We quote from the issue of March, 1918, as it records the impression then created and describes the circumstances of the Pastoral:

Just over forty-four years ago the Archbishop of Westminster delivered a memorable lecture at the Mechanics' Institution, Leeds, on "The Dignity and Rights of Labor." It was a bold pronouncement for those days, when the shadow of the old political economy lay heavy on the worker, but Archbishop Manning never lacked courage in defense of the oppressed and, in that lecture, he claimed not only reverence for the dignity of labor but a full acknowledgment of its rights. Moreover, he showed that those rights were exactly the same as those possessed by capital: the right of personal ownership, the right of liberty, the right of association. It was a clear declaration, as far as it went, of the Christian ideal as opposed to that of the Servile State.

Now in days far different, another Archbishop of Westminster has with even greater force and clearness and fullness come forward to state for the benefit of his flock the judgment of Christianity on

present social and industrial conditions, and the principles which must be followed in the coming reconstruction of society, if it is to be built upon peace and justice.

This keen diagnosis of our social and economic ills, wherein their origin and history are carefully traced and their remedies boldly prescribed, comes with all the freshness of a real, living and life-giving Evangel in the midst of the earth-found projects of the modern economist, long unaccustomed to regard man as God's creature and to base human rights on the Divine eternal law. Into this masterly document, in brief compass yet without confusion, are compressed the fundamental doctrines of Catholic social reform, so eloquently voiced by Leo XIII and Pius X, and the spirit of Him who "had compassion on the multitudes" breathes through the whole.

Through the splendid enterprise of the Westminster Catholic Federation this great pronouncement was promulgated, *urbi* if not *orbi*, by its insertion¹ in the *Times* of February 15, and, we understand, in other leading papers, and it cannot fail to bring before the eyes of thousands of outsiders, the stirring message which Catholicity has for a war-weary and sin-cursed world.

THE PASTORAL

The times through which we are passing are fraught with anxiety of every kind. It is not necessary to gaze upon the conflict of nations which afflicts the world to find matter of serious concern. At home, in our own midst there are signs of trouble and disturbance, only very partially revealed in the public press, but well known to those in authority, which portend the possibility of grave social upheaval in the future.

It is admitted on all hands that a new order of things, new social conditions, new relations between the different sections into which society is divided, will arise as a consequence of the destruction of the formerly existing situation. In this transformation, which will be for better or worse, the Catholic Church has her own special duty to perform, and her own part to play. What is that part to be in our own nation, and in the Empire?

Before we answer this momentous question it is important that we should understand how the present conflict has arisen, and endeavor to trace its causes, summarily at least, far beyond the events of the summer of 1914.

¹ The insertion referred to was possible only as a paid advertisement.

We may in this summary consider first the principles which in the main governed the various classes of this nation, and of other Christian nations, in their dealings with one another, prior to the religious disruption of the sixteenth century. Men then, as now, desired to make their way in life; they entered into competition with one another; they were prone, then as now, to yield to temptation, to overreach or to deal unfairly with their fellows. But the good and well-disposed had a guide, the self-seeking found a check, in the accepted principles that environed them. Competition in trade or industry, perfectly legitimate in itself, had yet so to be coordinated that the right of the individual worker to a true human existence should not be made dependent upon the unrestricted gain of him for whom he toiled, nor the interests of the community sacrificed to the aggrandizement of the successful individual. And before the minds of all — peasant, laborer, manual worker, tradesman, landowner, professional man, titled peer of the realm, and Sovereign of the Kingdom — there was ever present the certainty of a complete account to be one day rendered to a Just Judge, the Maker of rich and poor alike.

ENGLAND'S INSTINCTIVE CHRISTIANITY

These principles of Christianity have remained deeply imbedded in the mind and heart of the English people. They have influenced for a long space, and still influence to some extent, instinctively rather than consciously, the legislation of this country. But with the gradual disappearance of the authority which alone could enforce and give sanction to them, those who still follow these principles very often do not know why they do so, neither can they give an answer should their validity be challenged.

Thus gradually and almost imperceptibly a new relation of society came into being; and men and women, of high aim and of avowedly Christian belief, came to be dominated by ideas which had no ground in, or dependence upon, any Christian principle. Those who have studied the matter in detail have told us at length of the terrible conditions existing in this country less than a hundred years ago, in which conditions all thought of the rights of each individual soul or of the com-

munity as a whole was obliterated, and men felt no qualms about the practical enslavement and degrading impoverishment of multitudes in order that a few might possess and command the resources of almost unrestricted wealth. Desire of gain at all cost, without reference to the consequences thereby entailed upon vast numbers of the nation, became a ruling principle. The true end and purpose of existence were forgotten; the right of the individual received little thought; the interests of the community were sacrificed to the exaggerated well-being of the few. Wealth and material prosperity to be obtained by those who were able to attain them were a sufficient object for this life. In too many cases any higher aim was deliberately excluded or regarded as so problematical as to be undeserving of serious thought. An enormous development of trade took place. On the surface there was prosperity which seemed to admit of no limit or setback, and our teachers of even only forty years ago told us complacently that the economic system and development of England were of a very perfect kind, and worthy of imitation by less enlightened and less progressive nations.

A LESSON FROM THE ENEMY

Other nations had been learning the lesson — notably the confederation of nations which is now our chief enemy. With the thoroughness of purpose and scientific determination that characterize her, Germany has sought a world-wide predominance by setting boldly and consistently before herself those materialistic aims which for too long deluded and misled our English people. She desires "her place in the sun"; and, as might was only too often right in the industrial struggles within the limits of our own people, so imbued with the same principles, happily to an increasing extent now discarded among us, she claims that might is right in the world domination for which she is now struggling to her doom.

Happily, do we say, are those false principles being discarded among us; for, were it not so, the future of our peoples would be as overcast as is the future which the economic lusts of our enemies are bringing rapidly upon them.

The last thirty years have shown a surprising return to

saner doctrines and sounder principles in the teachings of our economists, and in the practice of our people, a return all the more astonishing because it has been instinctive rather than logical, and has little definite relation to religious teaching. God has watched over us in this respect, in spite of all our national sins and shortcomings, as He has so often done in the history of the past. Youthful ardor, self-sacrifice in face of common danger, recognition of the rights of all who do their part in the nation's struggles, no less than the compelling necessity of the moment, have led the peoples of the Empire to an abandonment of materialistic aims, and to a giving up of desires based purely on the present life, which would have seemed incredible not so many years ago.

AFTER THE WAR — WHAT?

But in every mind the cry is insistent. "The war will one day end. What then? What is the future of our country to be? Are all our sacrifices to go for nothing? Is our world to be a truer, a better, a happier place than it was before?" We proclaim loudly that we are now fighting not so much against the German people as against the principles which have impelled them to wage an unjustifiable war. We have to be on our guard lest those same principles, the desire of power and gain at the cost of the moral law, should reassert their sway in our own national and social life. Such desire once led us into practices at which the conscience of the nation now revolts. That reawakened conscience has been strengthened by the dread happenings of this war; and to some extent — though, alas! not wholly — these evil principles have been exorcized.

In making these comments on the order of things which too long prevailed in England, it is in no way necessary, nor would it be right, to impute conscious injustice to those who upheld and perpetuated the wrongs that all now regretfully recognize. Just as there must be countless numbers in Germany today who would condemn with the same execration as we do the crimes of which their rulers are guilty, could they only gaze upon them from the same point of view from which we contemplate them, so, when a false social and political economy still held unrestrained sway in England, many God-fearing and

honorable men were the unwitting accomplices of a system which had blinded and mastered them.

It is not, then, in any spirit of censure, either of master or servant, or of capitalist or workman, of employer or trades unionists — not with any desire to blame either the past or the present — but solely to prepare for and safeguard the future, that we venture to approach the problem that we are placing before you today.

What is that future to be — how is the social and political order to be reconstructed among us? There are some, a small minority as yet, but with increasing influence, who are proclaiming a policy of despair. They have looked, they will tell us, in various directions for a solution of the problem in vain. Those who in this country are the official representatives of religious teaching have failed — so these despairing voices assure us — to give any coherent answer to their questions. Thus they are compelled — again it is their voice that speaks — to the unwelcome conclusion that the existing relations of society are incapable of being remedied, and that things cannot be worse than they are at the present time. Let then, they proclaim, the existing order be overthrown and destroyed in the hope, baseless or well-founded, that out of the chaos and destruction some better arrangement of men's lives may grow up. It is the policy of which we see the realization and the first-fruits at the present time in Russia.

The vast majority of our people are held back, if not by religious motives, at least by their inborn practical sense, from suicidal projects of this kind. In this turmoil of uncertainty, in this longing for teaching and guidance, what is the place of those to whom God has given, and who have accepted, the fulness of the Divine Revelation under the authority of the Church of Jesus Christ? Will their voice be heard if, amid the clamor, it be upraised. If they be heard, have they a real message to deliver?

THE BETTER WAY

There can, we think, be no doubt at all as to the readiness of our countrymen to listen to the teachings of the Catholic

Church if an opportunity can be given to them of knowing what that teaching is. Their attitude towards the Church is rapidly ceasing to be one of indifference. Widespread interest is shown in our doctrines and practices, especially in all that we may say about the grave dangers that now threaten the world.

The very circumstances, too, of the war have brought hundreds of thousands of Englishmen into new and closer contact with the Catholic Church. British soldiers in Belgium and France have been profoundly affected by all that they have seen of her influence in those countries.

They are impressed with a new sense of the reality of religion. They observe its effectiveness in the face of danger and death; its power to heal, tranquilize and uplift; the definiteness and uniformity of Catholic teaching. In England, too, many have adopted Catholic emblems, beliefs, and practices which before the war would probably have repelled them. The message of war-shrines, crucifixes, and rosaries finds an echo in the heart of the people, a stirring, it may be, of the old Catholic tradition, never wholly obliterated. Belief in the efficacy of prayers for the dead is becoming more frequent; and it is dawning upon many that their choice must be between the religion of Catholics and no religion at all.

Again, social reformers of every school are turning more and more to Catholic tradition for their inspiration; and even in the aspirations and demands of extremists we may often discern that belief in the value of human personality, that insistence upon human rights, that sense of human brotherhood, and that enthusiasm for liberty which are marked features of Catholic social doctrine.

Another cause has been at work to remove the prejudices of former days. During the war Catholics, many of them suffering hitherto from a certain shyness and isolation, have been brought into intimate contact with the rest of the nation. The shouldering of common burdens, daily association with others in the manifold works of relief and organization, comradeship in the army, and cordial co-operation at home, have conduced to mutual respect and dissipated the old atmosphere of suspicion.

RELUCTANT EVIDENCE

It was, perhaps, inevitable that this growing sympathy with Catholic ideals should have irritated that small but noisy section of fanatics who are always ready to play upon the fears of the credulous or to re-echo those "No Popery" cries which we, in common with all men of right feeling, would very readily forget. At a moment when national unity is of vital importance, these people are seeking to stir up popular resentment against a loyal section of the population, regardless not only of justice and charity, but of the effect which such bigotry cannot fail to have upon the Catholics of other nations whose good-will we desire to retain.

With such calumniators as these, appeals to reason and justice appear to be unavailing. But they and the press which represents them are, we think, discredited by the bulk of the nation, to whose sense of fair-play we confidently appeal. And indeed we only refer here to the anti-Catholic agitation because it is an indirect evidence of that growing popular sympathy with Catholic ideals which has, by reaction, stirred it to life.

Our concern, at the moment, is not with exclusively Catholic interests, but with those common problems of national importance which have recently become so acute. It is a moment when all Catholics should reflect very seriously upon their duties as citizens and upon that special contribution to the common welfare which they are enabled to make as representatives of an age-long and world-wide tradition. The Catholic Church has helped to bring social order out of chaos in times past; many of our countrymen feel that her help is much to be desired in the coming reconstruction. They recognize, for instance, that she is able to combine social stability with liberty, and thus to avoid the calamities both of anarchy and tyranny, into one or the other of which this country might easily drift.

It is well for us to recall that the present social dislocation has arisen precisely because the teaching of the Catholic Church had been forgotten. In the sixteenth century England broke away from the religious unity of Europe. The popular faith

was violently ousted, and the spiritual authority of the Pope rejected. In course of time religious individualism gave place to religious indifference, and the twentieth century found the bulk of the people in this land frankly uninterested in church or chapel.

But the old Catholic social ideals and practices had also vanished; and here, too, a fierce individualism produced disastrous consequences. England came under the dominion of a capitalistic and oligarchic régime, which would have been unthinkable had Catholic ideals prevailed, and against which the working classes are now in undisguised revolt.

Capitalism began really with the robbery of church property in the sixteenth century, which threw the economic and social advantage into the hands of the land-owning and trading classes. The industrial revolution in the eighteenth century found England already in the hands of the well-to-do classes. Since then the effect of competition uncontrolled by morals has been to segregate more and more the capitalist from the wage-earning classes, and to form the latter into a "proletariat," a people owning nothing but their labor-power and tending to shrink more and more from the responsibilities of both ownership and freedom. Hence the increasing lack of self-reliance and the tendency to look to the State for the performance of the ordinary family duties.

OLIGARCHY AND INDUSTRIALISM

The English oligarchic spirit took its rise from the same sources as English capitalism, and by the beginning of the twentieth century was closely bound up and dependent on it. The territorial oligarchy had by then thoroughly fused with the commercial magnates, and the fusion had produced plutocracy. While the Constitution had increasingly taken on democratic forms, the reality underlying those forms had been increasingly plutocratic. Legislation under the guise of "social reform" tended to mark off all wage-earners as a definitely servile class. The result, even before the war, was a feeling among the workers of irritation and resentment, which manifested itself in sporadic strikes, but found no very clear expression in any other way.

During the war the minds of the people have been profoundly altered. Dull acquiescence in social injustice has given way to active discontent. The very foundations of political and social life, of our economic system, of morals and religion, are being sharply scrutinized; and this not only by a few writers and speakers, but by a very large number of people in every class of life, especially among the workers. Our institutions, it is felt, must justify themselves at the bar of reason; they can no longer be taken for granted.

The army, for instance, is not only fighting, it is also thinking. Our men have gained immensely in self-respect, in personal discipline, in a wider comprehension of national and social issues. They have met and made friends with members of other classes and occupations. Many for the first time in their lives have been properly fed and clothed, have learnt the pleasure and health that come from an out-door life, have realized what it means to belong to a body with great traditions. They have learnt the characteristic army scorn for the self-seeking politician and empty talker; they have learnt the wide difference between the facts as they have seen them and as the daily press reports them; and they have learnt to be suspicious of official utterances and bureaucratic ways. Above all, they have faced together hardship, pain and death; and the horror of their experience has forced them back to forgotten religious instincts. And the general effect of all this on the young men who are the citizens of "after the war" is little short of revolutionary.

A similar change has taken place in the minds of our people at home. The munition-workers, hard working but overstrained by long hours and heavy work, alternately flattered and censured, subjected sometimes to irritating mismanagement, and anxious about the future, tend to be resentful and suspicious of public authorities and political leaders. They, too, are questioning the whole system of society. The voluntary war-workers, again, have had their experience widened; not only are many of them doing useful work for the first time in their lives, and doing it well, but they are working in companionship with and sometimes under the direction of those with whom they would not, in normal times, have dreamt of

associating. They are readjusting their views on social questions.

There is, in short, a general change and ferment in the mind of the nation. Few suppose that after the war the social order will automatically adjust itself. Most realize that we must make a combined and determined effort to right it.

It is here that Catholic guidance, if offered with understanding and sympathy, is likely to commend itself. But this means that Catholics must clear their own minds of prejudice, and must deliver not their own message, but the message of the Catholic Church. If their minds are formed in accord, for instance, with the great Encyclicals of Leo XIII, they will seize the opportunity with courage and with a great trust in the people, and a still greater trust in God. They will work for social stability and liberty, for justice and charity, and help to draw together in national unity the sundered and embittered classes.

CATHOLIC SOCIAL REFORM

The Catholic principles of social reform cannot fail to commend themselves to the millions of men and women in this country, in whom a passion for social righteousness has been stirred: who, in the shock of war, have discovered and have revolted at the social unfairness which has prevailed for so long.

Is it surprising that these people, suddenly awakened to the un-Christian features of our civilization, should in their zeal for reform and their consciousness of power be tempted to root up the wheat with the tares? If some of them, cut adrift as they have been from Christian influences, are suspicious of all religious, as well as all political, organizations, our task must be, not to denounce them as impious revolutionaries, but to show them that the Catholic Church alone can purify and realize their aspirations. They simply do not know, for instance, that Leo XIII has denounced in terms as strong as they themselves are likely to use, the greed and self-seeking which have laid upon the working classes "a yoke little better than slavery itself."

Now there are certain leading features of the modern labor

unrest which, though their expressions may be crude and exaggerated, we recognize as the true lineaments of the Christian spirit. Its passion for fair treatment and for liberty; its resentment at bureaucratic interferences with family life; its desire for self-realization and opportunities of education; above all, its conviction that persons are of more value than property — these surely give us points of contact and promise a sympathetic welcome to our message.

We have only to show what is involved in these excellent ideals, for which we ourselves have labored and suffered — how there can be no rights without duties, how liberty implies responsibility, how suicidal is class war, how the Commandments of God are not only an obligation but a protection for man.

If we review the main principles of Catholic social teaching we shall observe how many of the utterances of "modern unrest" are merely exaggerated or confused statements of those very principles; and since, as has been truly said, "the Catholic Church is not afraid of enthusiasm," we should not find it hard to put before the most ardent their own ideals, in a more coherent and satisfying form than they could do it for themselves.

If they take their stand upon the dignity of man, whether rich or poor, we can show them how every human being, created by God and redeemed by Christ, has a much greater dignity than they had dreamt of. If they claim for every human being a right to a share in the fruits of the earth, a right to live a life worthy of man, we endorse that claim with Divine sanctions. If they protest against industrial insecurity and the concentration of capital in a few hands, we point out how they are suffering from the blow aimed at the Catholic Church in the sixteenth century. If they have had a hard fight to establish the right of association in trades unions, it was because the Catholic voice had been silenced in the land. If their instinct for education and self-realization has been stirred, it is but the awakening of an instinct developed among the people in Catholic days before our universities and secondary schools were diverted from their original purpose.

When once people come to see that we share their aspira-

tions they will be more ready to listen when we show them what those aspirations involve. They will learn to distrust false prophets and specious theorists. They will understand how might is not right; how society is not a conglomeration of warring atoms, but a brotherhood; how the family, which is the bulwark of liberty, would be injured by the introduction of divorce or the weakening of parental authority; how property has its rights, however much those rights may have been exaggerated; that cordial co-operation among all classes of society is necessary if their ideals are to be realized.

Understanding all these truths as parts of one Christian scheme of life, may we not hope that the people of this country will come to have a new conception of what Christianity means? Finding a guide whom they can trust in the complex social problems of today, will they not examine the claims of the Catholic Church to guide them in those religious perplexities which, under the pressure of war, they are beginning to feel?

THE CRISIS FOR CATHOLICS

If, then, it be true that there are many ears open to receive our voice, should we Catholics remain apathetic at this critical moment? The opportunity may never come again. If we stand aside from the social movements of the day, they will go forward without us, and our message may never be delivered. Can we face such a responsibility when we remember the fate that might overtake a country which has abjured Christian teachings? Pope Leo XIII has described it to us in his letter on "The Duties of Christians as Citizens":

"Nations and even vast empires themselves cannot long remain unharmed, since, upon the lapsing of Christian institutions and morality, the main foundation of human society must necessarily be uprooted. Force alone will remain to preserve public tranquility and order; force, however, is very feeble when the bulwark of religion has been removed; and, being more apt to beget slavery than obedience, it bears within itself the germs of ever-increasing troubles. The present century has encountered notable disasters: nor is it clear that some equally terrible are not impending. The very times in which

we live are warning us to seek remedies there where alone they are to be found — namely, by re-establishing in the family circle and throughout the whole range of society, the doctrines and practices of the Christian religion. In this lies the sole means of freeing us from the ills now weighing us down."

Catholics who have rallied with such splendid patriotism to the defense of the country will, we are confident, labor no less generously to reestablish that country on a Christian basis, to seize the opportunities and avert the dangers of the present social unrest. There is a place for every man and woman in this work. In the words of Leo XIII:

"Civil society, no less than religion, is imperiled; it is the sacred duty of every right-minded man to be up in defense of both the one and the other." ("The Condition of the Working Classes.")

In earnest prayer, in the frequentation of the Sacraments, and in the example of a good Catholic life we place our chief confidence. But with these we must combine a real understanding both of present social conditions and tendencies, and of the principles which will enable us to deal with them aright.

The experience of the past few years has shown how much may be done by the formation of social study circles among Catholics of all classes. By this method, far more than by attendance at occasional lectures or by desultory reading, the student obtains a real grasp of modern problems and the principles underlying them, and is able to exercise a marked influence on local opinion. Such study circles may well be organized among Catholic women also, who will now have the responsibility of the vote and take a more prominent part in public life. It is too much to expect a busy, overburdened priest to undertake in all cases the entire guidance of such study circles: but the clergy can encourage their formation and be ready to advise when occasion arises.

Again, we have the singularly effective instrument of Catholic social literature. Admirable Catholic text-books and manuals are now available, and every effort should be made to give them as wide a circulation as possible.

AMONG CATHOLICS AND NON-CATHOLICS

Of great importance, too, are those general Catholic organizations, such as the Catholic Federations, the Catholic Young Men's Society, and the Catholic Women's League, which aim at bringing together all Catholics, irrespective of their political views or social circumstances, upon the common platform of Catholic public life. The strengthening of their respective branches would enable us not only to forward Catholic interests and to protect religious liberties, but to set before the country in an effective way those Christian principles by which alone can be secured the orderly welfare of a free people. The work of such associations is intended to be constructive. Their aim is not merely to counteract false principles or to protest against injustice, but to build up, positively, a Christian social order. Hence they should be educative, and their members should fit themselves by assiduous study for the task of enlightening others.

Finally, we should co-operate cordially with the efforts which are being made by various religious bodies to remedy our unchristian social conditions. Without any sacrifice of religious principles, we may welcome the support of all men of good-will in this great and patriotic task. Already, certain important Christian organizations have been occupied in the endeavor to build up a common platform of social reform. Such efforts certainly deserve all the help, guidance, and co-operation that we can afford them.

Such then is the task, such the aim that we desire to place before you, that you may consider it in God's presence. Never has a greater responsibility been given to the Catholics of these lands than at the present time. We have it in our power to render to our fellow-countrymen, to the nation, to the Empire, services of immense value for the common well-being, no less than for the salvation of innumerable souls.

MAN'S TRUE END

The ultimate end of nation and Empire, as of the individuals that compose them, is to give glory to God, and to promote that glory by aiding and not checking men in the fulfillment of the purpose for which God made them.

So long as the teaching of the Catholic Church embodied the religious sentiments of the English people, this ideal was never deliberately set aside; and the religious edifices that grew up in the midst of a very sparse population, with the charitable and educational purposes which they once sheltered, are an abiding witness to what our forefathers accepted as principles of life and conduct.

Externally and superficially in our social structure, in the Government and Constitution of the Empire, the old order has not wholly disappeared. The recognition of God's part and place in civil ruling is less obliterated than in most other nations. But for nearly 400 years the action of the vivifying spirit that once animated rulers and ruled alike, has grown gradually weaker, and not so long ago seemed doomed to entire failure. God is now again, in His mercy, out of the very horrors of war, showing us how we may retrace our steps and rebuild the commonwealth on the teaching given to all generations for their healing in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, His Son.

We are once more reminded by the voice of the Catholic Church — that we, in our turn, may remind others who, perchance, may never have heard, or hearkened to, that voice — that there is no safety for the individual, or for society, except in the teachings of Christ Our Lord.

MAN'S TRUE RIGHTS

Each man receives from his Creator freedom to attain the end for which he was created. He has a right to a true human life, and to the labor whereby materially, that life may be maintained; and to that labor is due a wage proportionate at least to the maintenance of such true human life. In the same way he is entitled to have and to retain property as his own personal possession, and at the same time it is his duty to render to the society of men in the midst of which he lives, the service and obedience without which all corporate existence would be impossible.

In like manner Christ teaches us the sanctity and inviolability of family life; the diversity of the gifts that man re-

ceives, with the consequent inevitable difference in position, learning, acquirements and possessions which has ever characterized, and must always characterize the members of the human race; and the mutual dependence which must exist between all ranks of society if God's purpose is to be fulfilled.

If these things be remembered, if they be accepted as the basis of that rebuilding of our public life and government, then may we look forward with confident hope for the future. If they be forgotten, still more if they be deliberately set aside, greater calamity will come upon us than any war could inflict.

It is a part of your mission, dear Reverend Fathers, to bring these matters clearly and plainly before your flocks, so that they may exercise any influence that they possess in accordance with the social teachings of Christ and of His Church, and be the messengers to others outside the flock of what the Church actually teaches on these vitally important subjects. In accomplishing this mission much use should be made of the excellent publications of the Catholic Social Guild, which is ever ready to render aid in making known the sound principles which must underlie all true social reform.

May Our Divine Master, ever kind and considerate to rich and poor, to the learned and to the simple, and to all who seek Him with single heart, be your Guide and Teacher. May His Holy Mother, honored once throughout this realm of England as its Queen by right Divine and by the people's choice, be with us as we learn again the lessons that He alone can teach. May the whole nation take the lesson to heart, so that out of the sorrows and bitterness and tragedy of this time of war a new England may be built up which will give to God all the things that are God's, and to the commonwealth all that both society and the individual may justly claim.

IV. THE BISHOPS OF FOUR COUNTRIES

1. Pastoral Letter of the Bishops of Ireland on the Labor Question.
2. The Social Reconstruction Program Issued by the four American Bishops Constituting the Administrative Committee of the National Catholic War Council.
3. Extract from the Pastoral Letter of the Bishops of France on Conditions after the War.
4. Declaration of the American Hierarchy, on Industrial Relations in their Pastoral Letter.
5. Pastoral Letter of the German Bishops on Socialism.

1. PASTORAL LETTER OF THE BISHOPS OF IRELAND ON THE LABOR QUESTION ¹

VERY REVEREND AND REVEREND FATHERS AND DEAR BRETHREN IN CHRIST:

As pastors of the faithful children of St. Patrick we have deeply felt the pain and sorrow which a prolonged labor dispute, of singular mischief in its various complications, has brought on our people. Hence the responsibility now devolves upon us of addressing to you this pastoral letter in reference to the means by which such great evils, spiritual and temporal, as this deplorable quarrel has unfortunately produced may, through the divine mercy, be prevented in the years to come.

The great lesson from this sad experience is the imperative need of well-formed conciliation boards, duly representative of both sides, to adjust differences as they arise. Masters and men have a common interest in industry: and that is the way to maintain it for the common good. For the requisite organization strong Irish trade unions, conducted on sound principles, can do much in industrial centres, as they can likewise to serve other useful purposes of a kindred nature.

A strong association of workers is not likely either to accept less than a living wage or to plead compulsion when a collective bargain is authorized by a regular ballot of its members. The sense of Christian duty, as of manly self-respect and honor, has then fair play to influence conduct, and to develop a sound tone and tradition in industrial relations. The employers, likewise, need their unions. But disputes there will be. The making of a bargain in which a multitude is concerned, and the varying circumstances of persons and events, naturally lead to sharp divergences from time to time; and then a fair jury should have a chance of bringing in its verdict before the protagonists on either side let loose the horrors of war. Noth-

¹ February 11, 1914.

ing less is demanded by the interests of the parties themselves. Nothing less is fair to the public.

In connection with the labor question, it is the laborers who have the first claim on our consideration. Though there is no counting the number of unsuccessful manufacturers and of unprosperous merchants, business and trade make men rich, and industry will not flourish and will not give employment unless it brings wealth in its train. But for our part, when we desire ardently to see suitable industries thrive in town and country, our desire is not for the enrichment of any class, but for such employment and remuneration of Irish labor at home as will afford our working people a worthy livelihood, and stem the tide of depopulating emigration.

In backward districts, or where foreign competitors have got far ahead, or where from other reasons existing circumstances are unfavorable, the workers need not expect at the start the full measure of remuneration to which they are entitled when the industry has reached normal conditions. But out of the average thriving business the workman may well claim, in return for his honest day's work, what will at least procure worthy maintenance for himself and his little family, with such "outlet and outlook," to use the phrase of a living statesman in a like connection, as are implied in a reasonable opportunity to improve steadily the condition of his household.

Nothing less is fair recompense for hard work, temperance, and thrift. As a rule the laborers who toil at the heaviest work for the lowest pay have not received a fair share of the wealth they do so much to produce. Under the sway of materialist economics, less than a hundred years ago men and machinery were treated as one in the greatest manufacturing centres, except, indeed, that the machinery was better cared for.

But the Catholic Church has never accepted and never could accept the doctrine that there was any body of human beings that no one was bound to look after; and among the classes that compose lay society, apart from the infirm and destitute, no class has ever had from her the same warm, watchful, courageous care as those who literally earn their bread in the sweat of their brow. They needed it most, and they had it most. They had it when they were not the great power in the State

that they are now, that they need to be in our time for the protection of their interests, and that they deserve to be because of their essential services to the community.

Friendship for honest toil is seen from the first in the life of the Church. Amidst a perverse world that held manual labor in dishonor her Divine Founder was a carpenter by trade, the Prince of the Apostles and many of his colleagues were humble fishermen, the Doctor of the Gentiles was a tentmaker. The Fathers of the Church extolled the rights and dignity of labor. Her monks preached and practised manual toil. In the course of her combat with oppression, lasting through centuries, she emancipated labor by abolishing slavery, and kept it free by banning usury and by encouraging unions among different classes of workers for improvement and defence.

The combined action of the members of these associations was all the more effective in that they were welded together in the practice of religion, and conscious of the freedom which the truth of the Gospel brings to men. And when, in consequence of mechanical invention and the dominance of inhuman economics, the old protective associations were dissolved, or became unsuited to the circumstances of a new industrial era, and workmen were left to survive, if they could, where labor-saving machinery had supplanted them, the Church rejoiced at every legitimate combination of the toilers to uphold their rights and demand redress for their many grievances. Her zeal for them, her respect and love for them in the twentieth century flow from the same divinely established source from which sprang the demands for liberty and justice to the oppressed and enslaved toilers which her pastors uttered in the first centuries in face of a scornful pagan world. No absolutism of capital, no utter dependence of labor can be laid to her charge. A sharp division between the employer and the employed is none of her work. But since the dividing line has been so rigidly drawn she ever fosters harmony between labor and capital, as the sound basis of their common interest in industry, and she earnestly desires that each of them should have a fair return from the joint contributions of both.

The Encyclical of Leo XIII, issued in 1891, "On the Condition of Labor," contains great lessons for workers and em-

ployers alike. It is rightly called the charter of the working classes. Their rights, their duties, their dangers, their safeguards are set forth in it by the successor of the fishermen, the Vicar of Christ; by one who had their welfare at heart, as His Master had, and who was fortified with ample knowledge and full authority to uphold their interests within the full compass of the divine law.

Employers and men should not be content with such fragments of that noble Christian philosophy of social and industrial life as seem to suit them at the moment. They should read the encyclical over and over again; and the boys and girls of the industrial classes as they grow up should be thoroughly schooled in a teaching that is so appropriate to their condition in life, if they are to be trained aright for the duties of Christian citizenship.

[The Bishops then quote passages from Pope Leo's great encyclical calling for a quick remedy for the present misery and wretchedness of the poor; demonstrating the mistake of the Socialists in setting class against class and advocating the dispossession of those who possess; insisting on the power of religion to adjust the relations between employers and employed; insisting on the respect of rights wherever they are found, the security of owners of property on the one hand and the protection of the workmen on the other. Whilst contracts may be left free, there is a dictate of nature more imperious and ancient than any bargain: the remuneration should be a living wage.]

As might be expected, many foolish words, many unfair and wicked things, were said and written during the recent labor troubles. One of the most unbecoming and most ungrateful utterances was an attempt to belittle Leo XIII's great encyclical. It will be treated as of no account, or as a mere primer on the labor question by none but those who aim at destruction and not at construction, or who have never given it careful study, or who are incapable of realizing that a brief statement of fundamental truths in social and industrial life from a master mind and master authority may present its most far-reaching principles better than libraries of wild theory that cannot stand practical examination and must dissolve under

the scrutiny of reason, to say nothing of revelation. With the lapse of time questions must arise that will need their own solutions in the light of their own circumstances. But none is likely to emerge in the domain of industrial disputes that will fail to be helped towards a solution by a reference to the basis of right, declared as the law of divine justice in that courageous pronouncement.

In sorrow, not in anger, does the Holy Father endeavor to save men from following a will-o'-the-wisp into the quagmire of Socialism. But the evils that lead so many to embrace the Socialist creed, which, as a body of teaching, centres human existence on an impossible equality, or that impel them to have recourse to the ruinous strikes and lock-outs which are becoming more and more frequent, and the remedies for these evils, were not hidden from the keen vision of Leo XIII. If he has exposed the injustice and the folly of Socialist doctrine, which since then has considerably moderated its official tone, and vindicated man's rights to private property, proving it to be necessary in the interests of the workman, not less than of anyone else, he has also proclaimed the need for a far wider distribution of ownership than now exists; and he has done so as an adjunct to his memorable teaching on the living wage. "The law, therefore," he says, "should favor ownership, and its policy should be to induce as many of the people as possible to become owners!" Then he adds, "Many excellent results will follow from this; and, first of all, property will certainly become more equally divided."

The desire of ownership which, within due bounds, is natural and legitimate in man and may be highly commendable, springs from the laudable purpose of providing a stable way for himself and those depending upon him. The real explanation why multitudes of men, otherwise as good as their neighbors, have swelled the ranks of Socialism seems to be, not that they hated private property on principle, but that by nature and in fact they loved to have it, and saw no avenue leading to participation in it except the fantastic way that opens on the dismal swamp where there is to be State ownership of the instruments of production and distribution, and State intrusion everywhere. It is indeed, the duty of the State to see that the

national resources are turned to good account for the support and welfare of all the people; and, consequently, the State or municipality should acquire, always for just compensation, those agencies of production, and those agencies only in which the public interest demands that public property rather than private ownership should exist.

Fortunately the trend of land settlement in this country is in the direction of reasonably sized holdings owned by their occupiers; and under native management it is not too much to expect that a model system of employment will be developed by degrees in suitable variety, so that Christian comradeship between men and masters and a sense of joint interest may be the rule and not the exception. An opportunity to share in the profits or to acquire a co-partnership, or at least to benefit in some permanent way by the continued prosperity of the undertaking, might with great advantage be embodied in a scheme of employment. In this manner good, steady, whole-hearted work would be encouraged, and the men would have a chance of becoming masters through their own exertions.

The difficulty of conducting successfully a commercial undertaking in the management of which the workers would have a voice, may, in most cases, be too much for us at present. But it looks as if the industrial world were at a stage of transition when such things are likely to be; and, though machinery and invention have made a lasting change in the industrial system, it is to be remembered that the Church, in the interests of mankind, has ever desired a wide distribution of property, and in her days of greatest social power sanctioned a large control of industry by the workers. What she never did, and never can do, is to countenance wrongful interference with capital or contracts, any more than she can sanction an invasion of the rights of labor.

The smashing of labor would be a wicked and barbarous program however it might be explained. But, unless some such plan as we have just referred to be possible and adequate for the purpose in view, there is no legitimate way of giving effect to the almost equally barbaric formula of smashing cap-

ital. It is the use of capital by employers that is marked out for destruction.

Under Syndicalism the employer is compelled to disappear, and the workers are supposed to do everything and manage everything in an industrial federation away from State control. But without capital from some quarter nothing can be done in the world of industry, even if the management were competent; and to seize the property of employers would be wholesale robbery paving the way to anarchy.

Well, civilization cannot afford to dissolve into chaos in Ireland or anywhere else. It will not do to overthrow human society or reverse the wheels of progress. We have got to hold fast to Christian principles. If, therefore, associations of workers cannot acquire the means in a legitimate way, or if with the necessary capital they are incapable from their circumstances of conducting industrial concerns successfully, what is to be said is that a good man can thrive on fair wages if the housekeeping is what is ought to be, and there remain such plans as we have already indicated by which industrious workers in the course of their employment may share in the industry or become masters themselves.

Certainly the wage system should be so improved as nowhere to deserve the name of sweating or wage-slavery. "When workpeople," says Leo XIII, "have recourse to a strike it is frequently because the hours of labor are too long or the work too hard, or because they consider their wages insufficient. The grave inconvenience of this not uncommon occurrence should be obviated by public remedial measures." It is the inhuman offence of crushing labor that is responsible for the cry against capital. Whether our workers have yet arrived at the stage of setting much store on proprietorship in any degree or not, they rightly have a keen sense of the value of proper dwellings in which to live. Housing accommodation is not less important for them than the amount of their wages. What chance is there for health or comfort, temperance or thrift, home education or a Christian life, if a married man has not a sanitary dwelling of three or four rooms to shelter his family? A healthy home for the town worker finds a prec-

edent that should be followed, so far as conditions allow, in the fine accommodation for agricultural laborers that now adorns many an Irish countryside. It is a case in which private enterprise, the provision made by some employers, and the efforts of philanthropy need to be supplemented by municipal encouragement and State aid.

When, however, improved tenement houses in the city and separate cottages in the city or its suburbs have brought the dwellings of laborers and artisans up to a fair standard, and when the wages of the worst paid and hardest workers are higher than they are now, it is not to be expected that all disputes about wages, hours, work, and treatment will disappear. Even if there were no employers inclined to be exacting and no workers inclined to idle, it is in the nature of things, certainly in man's nature, and in the interests of progress, that changes should be sought with changing times and circumstances. An employer may resist where he should comply, a worker may make a new demand where he should rest content. The common sense, therefore, of the matter is that, in the spirit of mutual interest, the whole issue should be considered by capable men, fairly representing both sides with a view to an arrangement, if possible, and that no extreme course should be taken except as a last resort and in a constitutional way by the free ballot of men in full possession of the merits of the case on both sides. The public, also, should be afforded opportunities to form its opinion before war breaks out, if indeed the name of war can be applied to a conflict in which it is wrong to destroy property or do bodily hurt to anyone.

Hence, while not expressing an opinion on the inquiry recently held by the Board of Trade in Dublin, we cannot too warmly recommend some such scheme of conciliation as that set forth in the second part of the report then submitted. The proposals it contains offer something really valuable in substitution for the sudden or sympathetic strike or lock-out and they provide fairly for breaches of agreement. Its application in the capital of Ireland to as many departments of industry as possible would be a useful example for other Irish cities and towns. The matter seems to us so urgent as to brook no delay

beyond the time necessary to make carefully considered arrangements for each of the industries concerned.

In every civilized country, but certainly in Ireland, there ought, we repeat, to be an efficient means of settling labor disputes without recourse to strikes and lock-outs until all else fails. Woeful want in the homes of the workers, heavy loss to the employers, grave inconvenience and injury to the public, deplorable waste of time and resources, great setback to industry, sacrifice of the material interests of the nation for the advantage of her rivals, violence and bloodshed, and an avalanche of un-christian language charged with perverted opinions and voicing feelings of hatred, revenge, and all un-charitableness, are some of the evil consequences with which we are not familiar. Our people, indeed, are the last who should use this rough weapon against one another. They are kindly by nature, religious by conviction, and not unaware of the almost irreparable loss inflicted on Irish trade, industry, and commerce, by jealous neighbors in the past, or of the urgent need to develop native employment with the greatest care and patience. When it comes to a strike or a lock-out, too often, not right, but might, settles the issue. Well, it is not placing too high an estimate on the character of our people to say that if they had a controversy with another nation, and strength were on their side, they would be the first to propose that the justice of the case should be ascertained by a competent tribunal, and that right should be allowed to prevail. As Irishmen and as Christians they would use their strength for defence, not for offence, in dealing with outsiders. Now we owe one another, to say the least of it, as much as we owe the stranger, and resort to the rough arbitrament of a strike or a lock-out is out of keeping with our place in Christian civilization if more rational methods be available to assert our claims to fair play.

Mainly through trade unions, with all their short-comings, have the working-classes secured something corresponding with the protection which, in a different industrial order, the Church promoted in former times. Their organization is most desirable. If based on Christian principles, the more wide-

spread in industrial centres, and the more perfect it is, the better for all concerned. But were their strength ten times as great as it is, it would not be wise and it might be criminal to use it in the form of a strike to settle a labor dispute that could be fairly arranged in a conference between the parties. The same, of course, holds for a lock-out by employers. What is the use of saying that a sympathetic strike or lock-out may be justifiable in conceivable circumstances when the real point is that the sympathetic strike or lock-out is ruinous to industry, and therefore to employment, unless it be fenced round with most careful safeguards?

What, again, is the use of saying that a contract made under compulsion is not binding when the important point is, that unless the sacredness of contracts entered into by men enjoying average freedom in regard to them is upheld there is an end to the confidence in man's plighted word, which is the bond of human intercourse, the mainstay of fair dealing, and the basis of business enterprise everywhere? Disregard of contracts by workers may have its counterpart in disregard of contracts by employers, just as the sympathetic strike is matched by the sympathetic lock-out.

These are extreme expedients not readily justified. They are destructive engines of war; and only a sound scheme of arbitration and conciliation can restrain them from devastating the industrial field. How many industrial enterprises have perished, how many families of workers have been cast adrift within living memory, through strikes and lock-outs, in all their ramifications, that a well-manned tribunal of peace might have prevented?

Conciliation boards, constructed on wise lines, will go far to take the place of an ideal association of workers and employers, and, though they are not likely to prevent all conflicts between them, they will obviate constantly-recurring strikes and lock-outs, to the great advantage of both classes and of the general public.

Nothing is more important for trade and for every one dependent upon it than to draw employers and workers closely together. Once that is done, it causes little trouble to arrange, for instance, as regards overtime when a structure needs

to go up in a hurry, or a disabled ship calls for immediate attention in the repairing docks.

In the legitimate effort to eliminate sweaters and secure fair conditions of employment the advantage of having employment and the need to secure its continuance should never be overlooked. We want to attract shipping, trade and commerce to our shores. We need to establish suitable industries and put fresh life into those already in existence. The man who, instead of placing his money in a bank or investing it abroad, faces the risk of putting it into a project for the development of Irish industries, deserves credit and encouragement. He takes a line that too few of our people have taken, and when he does so it behooves us, as some return to him, and for the encouragement of others, to make his risk as light as we can. The interest of every class, particularly of the workers, demands that we should attract the use of capital, not frighten it away. The full programme in the interests of labor is to have as much employment as possible and to see that its conditions are fair to the workers.

The laborer, skilled or unskilled, should have a fair chance to improve his condition. It must not be too difficult for industry, ability, thrift and character to raise him to a position equal to his worth. One splendid advantage he enjoys in this country is the opportunity to educate his family on sound Christian lines. A good primary education, as a rule, can be had within easy reach, and, fortunately, the way to the technical or secondary school, or higher still, is beginning to open for the fine boys and girls that come from the laborer's household, and who are gifted with deft fingers or bright minds. In whatever else the Irish city worker may be at a disadvantage, he is no longer behind in the opportunity to give his children the education that is best for them.

It will do good to the rising generation if our young workers reflect how they came to enjoy the wealth of this fine educational inheritance. It was the rich dower of young workers in Ireland long ago. Once more it is their heritage, largely through the self-sacrifice of men and women who had something beyond justice and equity to bestow. More than strict justice is due in equity to the toilers who do the hardest and most

necessary work of the community, sometimes at peril to their lives, living very much from hand to mouth on the earnings of employment that is not at all times available. In some such spirit as this for the public good, as also from a sense that wages were inadequate, the State in recent years has been making most praiseworthy efforts to improve the condition of its industrial population. But before social legislation made any progress our Irish workers had experience of a still higher type of service in the sacrifice of those who gave their lives without personal reward to the Christian education of the poor.

This brings us almost to the conclusion of what we have to say. If we have deemed it right to touch briefly on many sociological questions in this letter, it is not because we consider that priests and laymen in this country need be specially occupied with set addresses on the evils of Socialism or Syndicalism, or strikes, or lock-outs. These subjects cannot, indeed, be too well understood by the shepherds and guides of the people; and it is a great acquisition of strength on the side of right that they are discussed in a variety of excellent little Catholic publications that are within the reach of all, and that all may read with lasting advantage. Moreover, a warning is necessary now and then.

But our main object, while fixing attention on the nature of the dangers with which our people have recently been confronted, is to urge, in the spirit of Pius X as of Leo XIII, the sovereign importance of preventing, by fair treatment and fair trial, the evils that evoke these crude, unchristian theories, and drive men to adopt these rough methods of redress. To this end, circles for social study, debate and work are specially useful. It is eminently a case where prevention is better than cure. Indeed, in applying a cure on any wide scale we have to go back to the ways of prevention. Accordingly, our chief concern is a full measure of proper treatment for the laboring classes, with ample encouragement to good, hard, honest work, but no encouragement to drink, idleness or inefficiency.

We have been throughout asserting the claims of justice and equity under existing industrial conditions. But as Christians we owe more to one another than the duties even of

social justice, "because the charity of God is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Ghost who is given to us."

We were not made for earth but for Heaven. Only when the perishable goods of this world pass away from us for ever do we enter on our eternal possessions and begin our true life with God. "It is more blessed to give than to receive." If we have much we can call our own, the Lord gave it for our welfare and for the relief of others, in whose person He may stand asking some of it back from us. If we have little, the Saviour had less for Himself, and it is His hard-pressed fellow-laborers He invites to come to Him that He may refresh them. In Christ we are one, and earthly possessions, or the want of them, do not count. If duty calls us to practice justice, patience, consideration, forbearance towards one another, we are also bound as Christians to be charitable in thought and word and deed. Let charity, then, which is the queen of virtues and the bond of perfection, reign in our hearts. "God is charity, and he that abideth in charity abideth in God, and God in him."

2. THE PROGRAM OF SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION

ISSUED BY THE FOUR AMERICAN BISHOPS CONSTITUTING THE
ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC
WAR COUNCIL ¹

FOREWORD

THE ending of the Great War has brought peace. But the only safeguard of peace is social justice and a contented people. The deep unrest so emphatically and so widely voiced throughout the world is the most serious menace to the future peace of every nation and of the entire world. Great problems face us. They cannot be put aside; they must be met and solved with justice to all.

In the hope of stating the lines that will best guide us in their right solution the following pronouncement is issued by the Administrative Committee of the National Catholic War Council. Its practical applications are of course subject to discussion, but all its essential declarations are based upon the principles of charity and justice that have always been held and taught by the Catholic Church, while its practical proposals are merely an adaptation of those principles and that traditional teaching to the social and industrial conditions and needs of our own time.

✠ PETER J. MULDOON, *Chairman*
Bishop of Rockford

✠ JOSEPH SCHREMS
Bishop of Toledo

¹The National Catholic War Council was composed of the Archbishops of the United States, thus organized with the approval of the great majority of the Bishops for the purpose of aiding their country and caring for Catholic interests during the great conflict. The executive authority of the Council was the Administrative Committee, comprising the four Bishops whose names appear at the bottom of the "Foreword." As the text of the "Foreword" shows, the four Bishops issued this program of Social Reconstruction in their capacity as the Administrative Committee of the National Catholic War Council.

✠ PATRICK J. HAYES ¹

Bishop of Tagaste

✠ WILLIAM T. RUSSELL

Bishop of Charleston.

SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION — A GENERAL REVIEW OF THE PROBLEMS AND SURVEY OF REMEDIES ²

"Reconstruction" has of late been so tiresomely reiterated, not to say violently abused, that it has become to many of us a word of aversion. Politicians, social students, labor leaders, business men, charity workers, clergymen and various other social groups have contributed their quota of spoken words and printed pages to the discussion of the subject; yet the majority of us still find ourselves rather bewildered and helpless. We are unable to say what parts of our social system imperatively need reconstruction; how much of that which is imperatively necessary is likely to be seriously undertaken; or what specific methods and measures are best suited to realize that amount of reconstruction which is at once imperatively necessary and immediately feasible.

Nevertheless it is worth while to review briefly some of the more important statements and proposals that have been made by various social groups and classes. Probably the most notable declaration from a Catholic source is that contained in a pastoral letter, written by Cardinal Bourne several months ago. "It is admitted on all hands," he says, "that a new order of things, new social conditions, new relations between the different sections in which society is divided, will arise as a consequence of the destruction of the formerly existing conditions. . . . The very foundations of political and social life, of our economic system, of morals and religion are being sharply scrutinized, and this not only by a few writers and speakers, but by a very large number of people in every class of life, especially among the workers." ³

¹ Now Archbishop of New York.

² A comprehensive discussion and development of the proposals set forth in this document will be found in Dr. Ryan's volume, *Social Reconstruction*: The Macmillan Company; 1920.

³ See his Pastoral Letter.

The Cardinal's special reference to the action of labor was undoubtedly suggested by the now famous "Social Reconstruction Program" of the British Labor Party. This document was drawn up about one year ago, and is generally understood to be the work of the noted economist and Fabian Socialist, Mr. Sidney Webb. Unquestionably, it is the most comprehensive and coherent program that has yet appeared on the industrial phase of reconstruction. In brief it sets up "four pillars" of the new social order:

- (1) The enforcement by law of a National minimum of leisure, health, education and subsistence;
- (2) The democratic control of industry, which means the nationalization of all monopolistic industries and possibly of other industries, sometime in the future, if that course be found advisable;
- (3) A revolution in national finance; that is, a system of taxation which will compel capital to pay for the war, leaving undisturbed the national minimum of welfare for the masses;
- (4) Use of the surplus wealth of the nation for the common good; that is, to provide capital, governmental industries, and funds for social, educational and artistic progress.

This program may properly be described as one of immediate radical reforms, leading ultimately to complete Socialism. Evidently this outcome cannot be approved by Catholics.

PROGRAM OF AMERICAN LABOR

Through its Committee on Reconstruction, the American Federation of Labor has issued a lengthy program of reform proposals and demands which may be grouped under the three heads of trade union action, labor legislation and general industrial and social legislation. The principal demands under the first head are: the legally guaranteed rights of the workers to organize and to carry on the normal activities of trade unions; a living wage; no reduction in present scales of wages; the right of labor to fix its hours of work; the eight-hour day;

equal pay for equal work by the two sexes; exclusive reliance by labor on trade-union effort to maintain fair wages; establishment of cooperative stores; and no organization of a political party by the workers. Labor laws demanded are: prohibition of wage working by children under sixteen years of age; abolition of private employment agencies; prohibition of all immigration for two years; and vocational education which will fit the young for life in an industrial society. By implication both the eight-hour day and the living wage are declared to be subjects for trade union action, not for legislation. Among the measures of general social legislation recommended are: a special tax on "usable land" not cultivated by the owner, and taxes on land values which would make the holding of idle land unprofitable; government housing; government ownership and operation of docks, wharves and water powers; taxes on excess profits, incomes and inheritances; and limitation of the power of the courts to declare laws unconstitutional.

While this program is more practical and more moderate and reasonable than that of the British Labor Congress, its proposal for taxing land into use could easily involve confiscation. On the other hand, it does not give sufficient consideration to the case of the weaker section of the working class, those for whom trade union action is not practically adequate; nor does it demand or imply that the workers should ever aspire to become owners as well as users of the instruments of production.

BRITISH QUAKER EMPLOYERS

Probably the most definite and comprehensive statement from the opposite industrial class was put forth several months ago by a group of twenty Quaker employers in Great Britain. In outline their program is as follows: A family living wage for all male employees, and a secondary wage in excess of this for workers having special skill, training, physical strength, responsibility for human life; the right of labor to organize, to bargain collectively with the employer and to participate in the industrial part of business management; serious and practical measures to reduce the volume and hardship of unemployment; provisions of such working conditions as will safeguard health, physical integrity and morals; the reduction so far as

practicable of profits and interest until both the basic and the secondary wage has been paid, and transfer to the community of the greater part of surplus profits.

The spirit and conception of responsibility that permeate every item of the program are reflected in this statement: "We would ask all employers to consider very carefully whether their style of living and personal expenditure are restricted to what is needed in order to insure the efficient performance of their functions in society. More than this is waste, and is, moreover, a great cause of class divisions."

AMERICAN EMPLOYERS

The only formal statements on the subject of social reconstruction that have yet come to our attention from an important group of American employers, are a declaration of principles and certain proposals by the National Chamber of Commerce. The declaration of principles was made at a convention of the organization, in Atlantic City, December 6, 1918. Beyond a general commendation of peaceful and friendly relations between employers and employees, it included nothing of importance on the labor phase of reconstruction. It condemned government operation and ownership of railroads, telegraphs and telephones, and demanded more moderate taxes and a modification of the Sherman Anti-Trust Law. More recently the executive officials of the Chamber have submitted to a referendum vote of its membership a statement, "with a view to furnishing a basis on which American industry can build a national labor program." The main specific proposals in this statement are: recognition of the right of workers to organize; adequate representation of both parties in the determination of employment conditions; a decent home and proper social conditions; no reduction in wages until all other costs of production have been brought down to the lowest possible level; and a system of national employment offices. Inasmuch as this organization represents more employers than any other association in the country, the vote of its members on these proposals will be of the greatest significance.

AN INTERDENOMINATIONAL STATEMENT

In Great Britain an organization known as the Interdenominational Conference of Social Service Unions, comprising ten religious bodies, including Catholics, spent more than a year formulating a statement of Social Reconstruction. (See the summary and analysis contained in the Catholic Social Year Book for 1918.) This statement deals with principles, evils and remedies. Presuming that Christianity provides indispensable guiding principles and powerful motives of social reform, it lays down the basic proposition that every human being is of inestimable worth, and that legislation should recognize persons as more sacred than property: therefore the State should enforce a minimum living wage, enable the worker to obtain some control of industrial conditions; supplement private initiative in providing decent housing; prevent the occurrence of unemployment; safeguard the right of the laborer and his family to a reasonable amount of rest and recreation; remove those industrial and social conditions which hinder marriage and encourage an unnatural restriction of families; and afford ample opportunities for education of all children industrially, culturally, religiously and morally. On the other hand rights imply duties, and the individual is obliged to respect the rights of others, to cultivate self-control, to recognize that labor is the law of life, and that wealth is a trust. Finally, the statement points out that all social reform must take as its end and guide the maintenance of pure and wholesome family life.

Such in barest outline are the main propositions and principles of this remarkable program. The text contains adequate exposition of the development and application of all these points, and concrete specifications of the methods and measures by which the aims and principles may be brought into effect. In the latter respect the statement is not liable to the fatal objection that is frequently and fairly urged against the reform pronouncements of religious bodies: that they are abstract, platitudinous and usually harmless. The statement of the Interdenominational Conference points out specific remedies for the evils that it describes; specific measures, legislative and other, by which the principles may be realized in actual life.

Especially practical and valuable for Catholics are the explanations and modifications supplied by the Year Book of the Catholic Social Guild.

NO PROFOUND CHANGES IN THE UNITED STATES

It is not to be expected that as many or as great social changes will take place in the United States as in Europe. Neither our habits of thinking nor our ordinary ways of life have undergone a profound disturbance. The hackneyed phrase: "Things will never again be the same after the war," has a much more concrete and deeply felt meaning among the European peoples. Their minds are fully adjusted to the conviction and expectation that these words will come true. In the second place, the devastation, the loss of capital and of men, the changes in individual relations and the increase in the activities of government have been much greater in Europe than in the United States. Moreover, our superior natural advantages and resources, the better industrial and social condition of our working classes still constitute an obstacle to anything like revolutionary changes. It is significant that no social group in America, not even among the wage-earners, has produced such a fundamental and radical program of reconstruction as the Labor Party of Great Britain.

A PRACTICAL AND MODERATE PROGRAM

No attempt will be made in these pages to formulate a comprehensive scheme of reconstruction. Such an undertaking would be a waste of time as regards immediate needs and purposes, for no important group or section of the American people is ready to consider a program of this magnitude. Attention will therefore be confined to those reforms that seem to be desirable and also obtainable within a reasonable time, and to a few general principles which should become a guide to more distant developments. A statement thus circumscribed will not merely present the objects that we wish to see attained, but will also serve as an imperative call to action. It will keep before our minds the necessity for translating our faith into works. In the statements of immediate proposals we shall start, wherever possible, from those governmental agencies and

legislative measures which have been to some extent in operation during the war. These come before us with the prestige of experience and should therefore receive first consideration in any program that aims to be at once practical and persuasive.

The first problem in the process of reconstruction is the industrial replacement of the discharged soldiers and sailors. The majority of these will undoubtedly return to their previous occupations. However, a very large number of them will either find their previous places closed to them, or will be eager to consider the possibility of more attractive employments. The most important single measure for meeting this situation that has yet been suggested is the placement of such men on farms. Several months ago Secretary Lane recommended to Congress that returning soldiers and sailors should be given the opportunity to work at good wages upon some part of the millions upon millions of acres of arid, swamp, and cut-over timber lands, in order to prepare them for cultivation. President Wilson in his annual address to Congress endorsed the proposal. As fast as this preliminary task has been performed, the men should be assisted by government loans to establish themselves as farmers, either as owners or as tenants having long-time leases. It is essential that both the work of preparation and the subsequent settlement of the land should be effected by groups or colonies, not by men living independently of one another and in depressing isolation. A plan of this sort is already in operation in England. The importance of the project as an item of any social reform program is obvious. It would afford employment to thousands upon thousands, would greatly increase the number of farm owners and independent farmers, and would tend to lower the cost of living by increasing the amount of agricultural products. If it is to assume any considerable proportions it must be carried out by the governments of the United States and of the several States. Should it be undertaken by these authorities and operated on a systematic and generous scale, it would easily become one of the most beneficial reform measures that has ever been attempted.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

The reinstatement of the soldiers and sailors in urban industries will no doubt be facilitated by the United States Employment Service. This agency has attained a fair degree of development and efficiency during the war. Unfortunately there is some danger that it will go out of existence or be greatly weakened at the end of the period of demobilization. It is the obvious duty of Congress to continue and strengthen this important institution. The problem of unemployment is with us always. Its solution requires the co-operation of many agencies, and the use of many methods; but the primary and indispensable instrument is a national system of labor exchanges, acting in harmony with state, municipal, and private employment bureaus.

WOMEN WAR WORKERS

One of the most important problems of readjustment is that created by the presence in industry of immense numbers of women who have taken the places of men during the war. Mere justice, to say nothing of chivalry, dictates that these women should not be compelled to suffer any greater loss or inconvenience than is absolutely necessary; for their services to the nation have been second only to the services of the men whose places they were called upon to fill. One general principle is clear: No female worker should remain in any occupation that is harmful to health or morals. Women should disappear as quickly as possible from such tasks as conducting and guarding street cars, cleaning locomotives, and a great number of other activities for which conditions of work and their physique render them unfit. Another general principle is that the proportion of women in industry ought to be kept within the smallest practical limits. If we have an efficient national employment service, if a goodly number of the returned soldiers and sailors are placed on the land, and if wages and the demand for goods are kept up to the level which is easily attainable, all female workers who are displaced from tasks that they have been performing only since the beginning of the war will be able to find suitable employment in other parts of the in-

dustrial field, or in those domestic occupations which sorely need their presence. Those women who are engaged at the same tasks as men should receive equal pay for equal amounts and qualities of work.

NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

One of the most beneficial governmental organizations of the war is the National War Labor Board. Upon the basis of a few fundamental principles, unanimously adopted by the representatives of labor, capital, and the public, it has prevented innumerable strikes, and raised wages to decent levels in many different industries throughout the country. Its main guiding principles have been a family living wage for all male adult laborers; recognition of the right of labor to organize, and to deal with employers through its chosen representatives; and no coercion of non-union laborers by members of the union. The War Labor Board ought to be continued in existence by Congress, and endowed with all the power for effective action that it can possess under the Federal Constitution. The principles, methods, machinery and results of this institution constitute a definite and far-reaching gain for social justice. No part of this advantage should be lost or given up in time of peace.

PRESENT WAGE RATES SHOULD BE SUSTAINED

The general level of wages attained during the war should not be lowered. In a few industries, especially some directly and peculiarly connected with the carrying on of war, wages have reached a plane upon which they cannot possibly continue for this grade of occupations. But the number of workers in this situation is an extremely small proportion of the entire wage-earning population. The overwhelming majority should not be compelled or suffered to undergo any reduction in their rates of remuneration, for two reasons: First, because the average rate of pay has not increased faster than the cost of living; second, because a considerable majority of the wage-earners of the United States, both men and women, were not receiving living wages when prices began to rise in 1915. In that year, according to Lauck and Sydenstricker, whose work

is the most comprehensive on the subject, four-fifths of the heads of families obtained less than 800 dollars, while two-thirds of the female wage-earners were paid less than 400 dollars. Even if the prices of goods should fall to the level on which they were in 1915 — something that cannot be hoped for within five years — the average present rates of wages would not exceed the equivalent of a decent livelihood in the case of the vast majority. The exceptional instances to the contrary are practically all among the skilled workers. Therefore, wages on the whole should not be reduced even when the cost of living recedes from its present high level.

Even if the great majority of workers were now in receipt of more than living wages, there are no good reasons why rates of pay should be lowered. After all, a living wage is not necessarily the full measure of justice. All the Catholic authorities on the subject explicitly declare that this is only the *minimum* of justice. In a country as rich as ours, there are very few cases in which it is possible to prove that the worker would be getting more than that to which he has a right if he were paid something in excess of this ethical minimum. Why, then, should we assume that this is the normal share of almost the whole laboring population? Since our industrial resources and instrumentalities are sufficient to provide more than a living wage for a very large proportion of the workers, why should we acquiesce in a theory which denies them this measure of the comforts of life? Such a policy is not only of very questionable morality, but is unsound economically. The large demand for goods which is created and maintained by high rates of wages and high purchasing power by the masses is the surest guarantee of a continuous and general operation of industrial establishments. It is the most effective instrument of prosperity for labor and capital alike. The principal beneficiaries of a general reduction of wages would be the less efficient among the capitalists, and the more comfortable sections of the consumers. The wage-earners would lose more in remuneration than they would gain from whatever fall in prices occurred as a direct result of the fall in wages. On grounds both of justice and sound economics, we should give our hearty support to all

legitimate efforts made by labor to resist general wage reductions.

HOUSING FOR WORKING CLASSES

Housing projects for war workers which have been completed, or almost completed by the Government of the United States, have cost some forty million dollars, and are found in eleven cities. While the Federal Government cannot continue this work in time of peace, the example and precedent that it has set, and the experience and knowledge that it has developed, should not be forthwith neglected and lost. The great cities in which congestion and other forms of bad housing are disgracefully apparent ought to take up and continue the work, at least to such an extent as will remove the worst features of a social condition that is a menace at once to industrial efficiency, civic health, good morals and religion.

REDUCTION OF THE COST OF LIVING

During the war the cost of living rose at least seventy-five per cent. above the level of 1913. Some check has been placed upon the upward trend by government fixing of prices in the case of bread and coal, and a few other commodities. Even if we believe it desirable, we cannot ask that the Government continue this action after the articles of peace have been signed; for neither public opinion nor Congress is ready for such a revolutionary policy. If the extortionate practices of monopoly were prevented by adequate laws and adequate law enforcement, prices would automatically be kept at as low a level as that to which they might be brought by direct government determination. Just what laws, in addition to those already on the statute books, are necessary to abolish monopolistic extortion is a question of detail that need not be considered here. In passing, it may be noted that government competition with monopolies that cannot be effectively restrained by the ordinary anti-trust laws deserves more serious consideration than it has yet received.

More important and more effective than any government regulation of prices would be the establishment of co-operative stores. The enormous toll taken from industry by the various

classes of middlemen is now fully realized. The astonishing difference between the price received by the producer and that paid by the consumer has become a scandal of our industrial system. The obvious and direct means of reducing this discrepancy and abolishing unnecessary middlemen is the operation of retail and wholesale mercantile concerns under the ownership and management of the consumers. This is no Utopian scheme. It has been successfully carried out in England and Scotland through the Rochdale system. Very few serious efforts of this kind have been made in this country because our people have not felt the need of these co-operative enterprises as keenly as the European working classes, and because we have been too impatient and too individualistic to make the necessary sacrifices and to be content with moderate benefits and gradual progress. Nevertheless, our superior energy, initiative and commercial capacity will enable us, once we set about the task earnestly, even to surpass what has been done in England and Scotland.

In addition to reducing the cost of living, the co-operative stores would train our working people and consumers generally in habits of saving, in careful expenditure, in business methods, and in the capacity for co-operation. When the working classes have learned to make the sacrifices and to exercise the patience required by the ownership and operation of co-operative stores, they will be equipped to undertake a great variety of tasks and projects which benefit the community immediately, and all its constituent members ultimately. They will then realize the folly of excessive selfishness and senseless individualism. Until they have acquired this knowledge, training and capacity, desirable extensions of governmental action in industry will not be attended by a normal amount of success. No machinery of government can operate automatically, and no official and bureaucratic administration of such machinery can ever be a substitute for intelligent interest and co-operation by the individuals of the community.

THE LEGAL MINIMUM WAGE

Turning now from those agencies and laws that have been put in operation during the war to the general subject of labor

legislation and problems, we are glad to note that there is no longer any serious objection urged by impartial persons against the legal minimum wage. The several states should enact laws providing for the establishment of wage rates that will be at least sufficient for the decent maintenance of a family, in the case of all male adults, and adequate to the decent individual support of female workers. In the beginning the minimum wages for male workers should suffice only for the present needs of the family, but they should be gradually raised until they are adequate to future needs as well. That is, they should be ultimately high enough to make possible that amount of saving which is necessary to protect the worker and his family against sickness, accidents, invalidity and old age.

SOCIAL INSURANCE

Until this level of legal minimum wages is reached the worker stands in need of the device of insurance. The state should make comprehensive provision for insurance against illness, invalidity, unemployment, and old age. So far as possible the insurance fund should be raised by a levy on industry, as is now done in the case of accidental compensation. The industry in which a man is employed should provide him with all that is necessary to meet all the needs of his entire life. Therefore, any contribution to the insurance fund from the general revenues of the state should be only slight and temporary. For the same reason no contribution should be exacted from any worker who is not getting a higher wage than is required to meet the present needs of himself and family. Those who are below that level can make such a contribution only at the expense of their present welfare. Finally, the administration of the insurance laws should be such as to interfere as little as possible with the individual freedom of the worker and his family. Any insurance scheme, or any administration method, that tends to separate the workers into a distinct and dependent class, that offends against their domestic privacy and independence, or that threatens individual self-reliance and self-respect, should not be tolerated. The ideal to be kept in mind is a condition in which all the workers would themselves have the income and the responsibility of providing for all the needs

and contingencies of life, both present and future. Hence all forms of State insurance should be regarded as merely a lesser evil, and should be so organized and administered as to hasten the coming of the normal condition.

The life insurance offered to soldiers and sailors during the war should be continued, so far as the enlisted men are concerned. It is very doubtful whether the time has yet arrived when public opinion would sanction the extension of general life insurance by the Government to all classes of the community.

The establishment and maintenance of municipal health inspection in all schools, public and private, is now pretty generally recognized as of great importance and benefit. Municipal clinics where the poorer classes could obtain the advantage of medical treatment by specialists at a reasonable cost would likewise seem to have become a necessity. A vast amount of unnecessary sickness and suffering exists among the poor and the lower middle classes because they cannot afford the advantages of any other treatment except that provided by the general practitioner. Every effort should be made to supply wage-earners and their families with specialized medical care through development of group medicine. Free medical care should be given only to those who cannot afford to pay.

LABOR PARTICIPATION IN INDUSTRIAL MANAGEMENT

The right of labor to organize and to deal with employers through representatives has been asserted above in connection with the discussion of the War Labor Board. It is to be hoped that this right will never again be called in question by any considerable number of employers. In addition to this, labor ought gradually to receive greater representation in what the English group of Quaker employers have called the "industrial" part of business management—"the control of processes and machinery; nature of product; engagement and dismissal of employees; hours of work, rates of pay, bonuses, etc.; welfare work; shop discipline; relations with trade unions." The establishment of shop committees, working wherever possible with the trade union, is the method suggested by this group of employers for giving the employees the proper share of in-

dustrial management. There can be no doubt that a frank adoption of these means and ends by employers would not only promote the welfare of the workers, but vastly improve the relations between them and their employers, and increase the efficiency and productiveness of each establishment.

There is no need here to emphasize the importance of safety and sanitation in work places, as this is pretty generally recognized by legislation. What is required is an extension and strengthening of many of the existing statutes, and a better administration and enforcement of such laws everywhere.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

The need of industrial, or as it has come to be more generally called, vocational training, is now universally acknowledged. In the interest of the nation as well as in that of the workers themselves, this training should be made substantially universal. While we cannot now discuss the subject in any detail, we do wish to set down two general observations. First, the vocational training should be offered in such forms and conditions as not to deprive the children of the working classes of at least the elements of a cultural education. A healthy democracy cannot tolerate a purely industrial or trade education for any class of its citizens. We do not want to have the children of the wage-earners put into a special class in which they are marked as outside the sphere of opportunities for culture. The second observation is that the system of vocational training should not operate so as to weaken in any degree our parochial schools or any other class of private schools. Indeed, the opportunities of the system should be extended to all qualified private schools on exactly the same basis as to public schools. We want neither class divisions in education nor a State monopoly of education.

CHILD LABOR

The question of education naturally suggests the subject of child labor. Public opinion in the majority of the states of our country has set its face inflexibly against the continuous employment of children in industry before the age of sixteen years. Within a reasonably short time all of our states, ex-

cept some stagnant ones, will have laws providing for this reasonable standard. The education of public opinion must continue, but inasmuch as the process is slow, the abolition of child labor in certain sections seems unlikely to be brought about by the legislatures of those states, and since the Keating-Owen Act has been declared unconstitutional, there seems to be no device by which this reproach to our country can be removed except that of taxing child labor out of existence. This method is embodied in an amendment to the Federal Revenue Bill which would impose a tax of ten per cent. on all goods made by children.

SUFFICIENT FOR THE PRESENT

Probably the foregoing proposals comprise everything that is likely to have practical value in a program of immediate social reconstruction for America. Substantially all of these methods, laws and recommendations have been recognized in principle by the United States during the war, or have been indorsed by important social and industrial groups and organizations. Therefore, they are objects that we can set before the people with good hope of obtaining a sympathetic and practical response. Were they all realized a great step would have been taken in the direction of social justice. When they are all put into operation the way will be easy and obvious to still greater and more beneficial results.

ULTIMATE AND FUNDAMENTAL REFORMS

Despite the practical and immediate character of the present statement, we cannot entirely neglect the question of ultimate aims and a systematic program; for other groups are busy issuing such systematic pronouncements, and we all need something of the kind as a philosophical foundation and as a satisfaction to our natural desire for comprehensive statements.

It seems clear that the present industrial system is destined to last for a long time in its main outlines. That is to say, private ownership of capital is not likely to be supplanted by a collectivist organization of industry at a date sufficiently near to justify any present action based on the hypothesis of its arrival. This forecast we recognize as not only extremely prob-

able, but as highly desirable; for, other objections apart, Socialism would mean bureaucracy, political tyranny, the helplessness of the individual as a factor in the ordering of his own life, and in general social inefficiency and decadence.

MAIN DEFECTS OF PRESENT SYSTEM

Nevertheless, the present system stands in grievous need of considerable modifications and improvement. Its main defects are three: Enormous inefficiency and waste in the production and distribution of commodities; insufficient incomes for the majority of wage-earners, and unnecessarily large incomes for a small minority of privileged capitalists. Inefficiency in the production and distribution of goods would be in great measure abolished by the reforms that have been outlined in the foregoing pages. Production would be greatly increased by universal living wages, by adequate industrial education, and by harmonious relations between labor and capital on the basis of adequate participation by the former in all the industrial aspects of business management. The wastes of commodity distribution could be practically all eliminated by co-operative mercantile establishments, and co-operative selling and marketing associations.

CO-OPERATION AND CO-PARTNERSHIP

Nevertheless, the full possibilities of increased production will not be realized so long as the majority of the workers remain mere wage-earners. The majority must somehow become owners, or at least in part, of the instruments of production. They can be enabled to reach this stage gradually through co-operative productive societies and co-partnership arrangements. In the former, the workers own and manage the industries themselves; in the latter they own a substantial part of the corporate stock and exercise a reasonable share in the management. However slow the attainment of these ends, they will have to be reached before we can have a thoroughly efficient system of production, or an industrial and social order that will be secure from the danger of revolution. It is to be noted that this particular modification of the existing order, though far-reaching and involving to a great extent the abolition of the wage sys-

tem, would not mean the abolition of private ownership. The instruments of production would still be owned by individuals, not by the State.

INCREASED INCOMES FOR LABOR

The second great evil, that of insufficient income for the majority, can be removed only by providing the workers with more income. This means not only universal living wages, but the opportunity of obtaining something more than that amount for all who are willing to work hard and faithfully. All the other measures for labor betterment recommended in the preceding pages would likewise contribute directly or indirectly to a more just distribution of wealth in the interest of the laborer.

ABOLITION AND CONTROL OF MONOPOLIES

For the third evil mentioned above, excessive gains by a small minority of privileged capitalists, the main remedies are prevention of monopolistic control of commodities, adequate government regulation of such public service monopolies as will remain under private operation, and heavy taxation of incomes, excess profits and inheritances. The precise methods by which genuine competition may be restored and maintained among businesses that are naturally competitive, cannot be discussed here; but the principle is clear that human beings cannot be trusted with the immense opportunities for oppression and extortion that go with the possession of monopoly power. That the owners of public service monopolies should be restricted by law to a fair or average return on their actual investment, has long been a recognized principle of the courts, the legislatures, and public opinion. It is a principle which should be applied to competitive enterprises likewise, with the qualification that something more than the average rate of return should be allowed to men who exhibit exceptional efficiency. However, good public policy, as well as equity, demands that these exceptional business men share the fruits of their efficiency with the consumer in the form of lower prices. The man who utilizes his ability to produce cheaper than his competitors for the purpose of exacting from the public as high a price for his product as is necessary for the least efficient busi-

ness man, is a menace rather than a benefit to industry and society.

Our immense war debt constitutes a particular reason why incomes and excess profits should continue to be heavily taxed. In this way two important ends will be attained: the poor will be relieved of injurious tax burdens, and the small class of specially privileged capitalists will be compelled to return a part of their unearned gains to society.

A NEW SPIRIT A VITAL NEED

"Society," said Pope Leo XIII, "can be healed in no other way than by a return to Christian life and Christian institutions." The truth of these words is more widely perceived to-day than when they were written, more than twenty-seven years ago. Changes in our economic and political systems will have only partial and feeble efficacy if they be not reinforced by the Christian view of work and wealth. Neither the moderate reforms advocated in this paper, nor any other program of betterment or reconstruction will prove reasonably effective without a reform in the spirit of both labor and capital. The laborer must come to realize that he owes his employer and society an honest day's work in return for a fair wage, and that conditions cannot be substantially improved until he roots out the desire to get a maximum of return for a minimum of service. The capitalist must likewise get a new viewpoint. He needs to learn the long-forgotten truth that wealth is stewardship, that profit-making is not the basic justification of business enterprise, and that there are such things as fair profits, fair interest and fair prices. Above and before all, he must cultivate and strengthen within his mind the truth which many of his class have begun to grasp for the first time during the present war; namely, that the laborer is a human being, not merely an instrument of production; and that the laborer's right to a decent livelihood is the first moral charge upon industry. The employer has a right to get a reasonable living out of his business, but he has no right to interest on his investment until his employees have obtained at least living wages. This is the human and Christian, in contrast to the purely commercial and pagan, ethics of industry.

3. EXTRACT FROM THE PASTORAL LETTER OF THE FRENCH HIERARCHY ¹

UNION AMONG SOCIAL CLASSES

WE united to oppose the unjust aggression which imperilled the integrity and independence of the nation. Our union must endure; necessary as it is for the defense of the country, it is no less necessary for rehabilitation.

It is imperative that religious quarrels be forever banished from our midst, and that everyone should be allowed to be faithful to his religious convictions without fear of ostracism or disfavor.

The union of classes cemented during the war by common devotion and sacrifice must continue in time of peace. Struggles between the various classes could not but be fatal to all. According to the teaching of the Church which, after the example of her divine Founder, has always befriended the small and the weak, inequality of position in the world is an inevitable consequence of inequality of intelligence, talents, strength, health and the diversity of the circumstances of life. One must accept it as a disposition of Providence and a social necessity.

In like manner, the right to hold property is a natural right. It is the safeguard of family life, the stimulus and the reward of work. Collectivist socialism is, at once, an error and a peril. The means of reestablishing and preserving peace in society consist in the observance among the different classes of their reciprocal duties, according to the teaching of the Gospel. Let employers and workmen understand that they depend upon each other, and let them agree to be upright with each other in order to promote their common interests by friendly and productive cooperation, instead of jeopardizing them by fruitless struggles.

As for ourselves, Ministers of Him whose heart was moved

¹ In the spring of 1919.

to compassion by all human miseries, we open our arms and our hearts to our dear people. We are ready to work with them toward the betterment of their lot by every legitimate means, and we believe we can assure them that, if they have other friends besides us, they have none who are more sincere, more devoted, and more disinterested.

1. EXTRACT FROM THE PASTORAL LETTER OF
THE ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS OF THE
UNITED STATES¹

IN 1891, Pope Leo XIII published his Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, a document which shows the insight of that great Pontiff into the industrial conditions of the time, and his wisdom in pointing out the principles needed for the solving of economic problems. "That the spirit of revolutionary change which has long been disturbing the nations of the world, should have passed beyond the sphere of politics and made its influence felt in the cognate sphere of practical economics, is not surprising. The elements of the conflict now raging are unmistakable, in the vast expansion of industrial pursuits and the marvelous discoveries of science; in the changed relations between masters and workmen; in the enormous fortunes of some few individuals and the utter poverty of the masses; in the increased self-reliance and closer mutual combination of the working classes; as also, finally, in the prevailing moral degeneracy. The momentous gravity of the state of things now obtaining fills every mind with painful apprehension; wise men are discussing it; practical men are proposing schemes; popular meetings, legislatures and rulers of nations are all busied with it — and actually there is no question that has taken a deeper hold on the public mind."

How fully these statements apply to our present situation, must be clear to all who have noted the course of events during the year just elapsed. The War indeed has sharpened the issues and intensified the conflict that rages in the world of industry; but the elements, the parties and their respective attitudes are practically unchanged. Unchanged also are the principles which must be applied, if order is to be restored and placed on such a permanent basis that our people may continue their peaceful pursuits without dread of further disturbance.

¹ Published Feb. 22, 1920.

So far as men are willing to accept those principles as the common ground on which all parties may meet and adjust their several claims, there is hope of a settlement without the more radical measures which the situation seemed but lately to be forcing on public authority. But in any event, the agitation of the last few months should convince us that something more is needed than temporary arrangements or local readjustments. The atmosphere must be cleared so that, however great the difficulties which presently block the way, men of good will may not, through erroneous preconceptions, go stumbling on from one detail to another, thus adding confusion to darkness of counsel.

NATURE OF THE QUESTION

"It is the opinion of some," says Pope Leo XIII, "and the error is already very common, that the social question is merely an economic one, whereas in point of fact, it is first of all a moral and religious matter, and for that reason its settlement is to be sought mainly in the moral law and the pronouncements of religion" (Apostolic Letter, *Graves de communi*, January 18, 1901). These words are as pertinent and their teaching as necessary today as they were nineteen years ago. Their meaning, substantially, has been reaffirmed by Pope Benedict XV in his recent statement that "without justice and charity there will be no social progress." The fact that men are striving for what they consider to be their rights, puts their dispute on a moral basis; and wherever justice may lie, whichever of the opposing claims may have the better foundation, it is justice that all demand.

In the prosecution of their respective claims, the parties have, apparently, disregarded the fact that the people as a whole have a prior claim. The great number of unnecessary strikes which have occurred within the last few months, is evidence that justice has been widely violated as regards the rights and needs of the public. To assume that the only rights involved in an industrial dispute are those of capital and labor, is a radical error. It leads, practically, to the conclusion that at any time and for an indefinite period, even the most necessary products

can be withheld from general use until the controversy is settled. In fact, while it lasts, millions of persons are compelled to suffer hardship for want of goods and services which they require for reasonable living. The first step, therefore, toward correcting the evil is to insist that the rights of the community shall prevail, and that no individual claim conflicting with those rights shall be valid.

Among those rights is that which entitles the people to order and tranquility as the necessary condition for social existence. Industrial disturbance invariably spreads beyond the sphere in which it originates, and interferes, more or less seriously, with other occupations. The whole economic system is so compacted together and its parts are so dependent one upon the other, that the failure of a single element, especially if this be of vital importance, must affect all the rest. The disorder which ensues is an injustice inflicted upon the community; and the wrong is the greater because, usually, there is no redress. Those who are responsible for it pursue their own ends without regard for moral consequences and, in some cases, with no concern for the provisions of law. When such a temper asserts itself, indignation is aroused throughout the country and the authorities are urged to take action. This, under given circumstances, may be the only possible course; but, as experience shows, it does not eradicate the evil. A further diagnosis is needed. The causes of industrial trouble are generally known, as are also the various phases through which it develops and the positions which the several parties assume. The more serious problem is to ascertain why, in such conditions, men fail to see their obligations to one another and to the public, or seeing them, refuse to fulfill them except under threat and compulsion.

MUTUAL OBLIGATIONS

"The great mistake in regard to the matter now under consideration is to take up with the notion that class is naturally hostile to class, and that the wealthy and the workingmen are intended by nature to live in mutual conflict" (*Rerum Novarum*). On the contrary, as Pope Leo adds, "each needs the other: Capital cannot do without Labor, nor Labor without Capital. Religion is a powerful agency in drawing the rich

and the bread-winner together, by reminding each class of its duties to the other and especially of the obligation of justice. Religion teaches the laboring man and the artisan to carry out honestly and fairly all equitable agreements freely arranged, to refrain from injuring person or property, from using violence and creating disorder. It teaches the owner and employer that the laborer is not their bondsman, that in every man they must respect his dignity and worth as a man and as a Christian; that labor is not a thing to be ashamed of, if we listen to right reason and to Christian philosophy, but is an honorable calling, enabling a man to sustain his life in a way upright and creditable; and that it is shameful and inhuman to treat men like chattels, as means for making money, or as machines for grinding out work." The moral value of man and the dignity of human labor are cardinal points in this whole question. Let them be the directive principles in industry, and they will go far toward preventing disputes. By treating the laborer first of all as a man, the employer will make him a better working-man; by respecting his own moral dignity as a man, the laborer will compel the respect of his employer and of the community.

The settlement of our industrial problems would offer less difficulty if, while upholding its rights, each party were disposed to meet the other in a friendly spirit. The strict requirements of justice can be fulfilled without creating animosity; in fact, where this arises, it is apt to obscure the whole issue. On the contrary, a manifest desire to win over, rather than drive, the opponent to the acceptance of equitable terms, would facilitate the recognition of claims which are founded in justice. The evidence of such a disposition would break down the barriers of mistrust and set up in their stead the bond of good will. Not an armistice but a conciliation would result; and this would establish all parties in the exercise of their rights and the cheerful performance of their duties.

RESPECTIVE RIGHTS

The right of labor to organize, and the great benefit to be derived from workingmen's associations, was plainly set forth by Pope Leo XIII. In this connection, we would call attention to two rights, one of employes and the other of employers,

the violation of which contributes largely to the existing unrest and suffering. The first is the right of the workers to form and maintain the kind of organization that is necessary and that will be most effectual in securing their welfare. The second is the right of employers to the faithful observance by the labor unions of all contracts and agreements. The unreasonableness of denying either of these rights is too obvious to require proof or explanation.

A dispute that cannot be adjusted by direct negotiation between the parties concerned, should always be submitted to arbitration. Neither employer nor employe may reasonably reject this method on the ground that it does not bring about perfect justice. No human institution is perfect or infallible; even our courts of law are sometimes in error. Like the law court, the tribunal of industrial arbitration provides the nearest approach to justice that is practically attainable; for the only alternative is economic force, and its decisions have no necessary relation to the decrees of justice. They show which party is economically stronger, not which is in the right.

The right of labor to a living wage, authoritatively and eloquently reasserted more than a quarter of a century ago by Pope Leo XIII, is happily no longer denied by any considerable number of persons. What is principally needed now is that its content should be adequately defined, and that it should be made universal in practice, through whatever means will be at once legitimate and effective. In particular, it is to be kept in mind that a living wage includes not merely decent maintenance for the present, but also a reasonable provision for such future needs as sickness, invalidity and old age. Capital likewise has its rights. Among them is the right to "a fair day's work for a fair day's pay," and the right to returns which will be sufficient to stimulate thrift, saving, initiative, enterprise, and all those directive and productive energies which promote social welfare.

BENEFITS OF ASSOCIATION

In his pronouncement on Labor (*Rerum Novarum*) Pope Leo XIII describes the advantages to be derived by both employer and employe from "associations and organizations which draw the two classes more closely together." Such associations

are especially needed at the present time. While the labor union or trade union has been, and still is, necessary in the struggle of the workers for fair wages and fair conditions of employment, we have to recognize that its history, methods and objects have made it essentially a militant organization. The time seems now to have arrived when it should be, not supplanted, but supplemented by associations or conferences, composed jointly of employers and employes, which will place emphasis upon the common interests rather than the divergent aims of the two parties, upon cooperation rather than conflict. Through such arrangements, all classes would be greatly benefited. The worker would participate in those matters of industrial management which directly concern him and about which he possesses helpful knowledge; he would acquire an increased sense of personal dignity and personal responsibility, take greater interest and pride in his work, and become more efficient and more contented. The employer would have the benefit of willing cooperation from, and harmonious relations with, his employes. The consumer, in common with employer and employe, would share in the advantages of larger and steadier production. In a word, industry would be carried on as a cooperative enterprise for the common good, and not as a contest between two parties for a restricted product.

Deploring the social changes which have divided "society into two widely different castes," of which one "holds power because it holds wealth," while the other is "the needy and powerless multitude," Pope Leo XIII declared that the remedy is "to induce as many as possible of the humbler classes to become owners" (*Rerum Novarum*). This recommendation is in exact accord with the traditional teaching and practice of the Church. When her social influence was greatest, in the later Middle Ages, the prevailing economic system was such that the workers were gradually obtaining a larger share in the ownership of the lands upon which, and the tools with which, they labored. Though the economic arrangements of that time cannot be restored, the underlying principle is of permanent application, and is the only one that will give stability to industrial society. It should be applied to our present system as rapidly as conditions will permit.

Whatever may be the industrial and social remedies which will approve themselves to the American people, there is one that, we feel confident, they will never adopt. That is the method of revolution. For it there is neither justification nor excuse under our form of government. Through the ordinary and orderly processes of education, organization and legislation, all social wrongs can be righted. While these processes may at times seem distressingly slow, they will achieve more in the final result than violence or revolution. The radicalism, and worse than radicalism, of the labor movement in some of the countries of Europe, has no lesson for the workers of the United States, except as an example of methods to be detested and avoided.

Pope Benedict has recently expressed a desire that the people should study the great encyclicals on the social question of his predecessor, Leo XIII. We heartily commend this advice to the faithful and, indeed, to all the people of the United States. They will find in these documents the practical wisdom which the experience of centuries has stored up in the Holy See and, moreover, that solicitude for the welfare of mankind which fitly characterizes the Head of the Catholic Church.

5. PASTORAL LETTER OF THE GERMAN BISHOPS ON SOCIALISM

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

THE following estimate of modern Socialism is of the utmost importance. It is given by men best qualified to judge of it impartially, as their position required them to do. It comes to us, furthermore, from the country that gave birth to this movement, in which it developed most successfully, and where its workings could be studied under the most favorable conditions.

Those who have merely considered the economic tenets of Socialism, as they were proposed to them for political purposes, may be somewhat startled at the well-considered and carefully worded statements of this joint pastoral. Individual Socialists, with but little interest in the ulterior designs of their leaders and in the ultimate tendencies of the movement to which they subscribe from purely industrial motives, may be far from wishing to embrace all the erroneous doctrines of Socialism here set down and formally condemned,—as of necessity they must be condemned by every Catholic.

There is question here, not of an ideal Socialism, such as some of its followers have pictured for themselves, but of the actual Socialist movement as it has always existed in the International, and as it can be studied historically, in its effects, where it has been able to throw off its political trammels and freely disclose itself. In France, Germany, Spain, Portugal, Mexico, Russia, and wherever else it has been able for a time to express itself freely, it has answered fully to the description given to it by the German Hierachy. It is everywhere, openly or covertly, seeking the destruction of the Catholic schools, opposing in its literature the doctrines and morality of the Church, and planning to effect her ruin, if that could possibly be compassed by any human power. How far any particular

association, labelled "Socialist," corresponds to this description can be ascertained in each instance. Ultimate perversion through contact with the materialistic literature of Socialism will follow with moral certainty.

It may be a matter of surprise that the men responsible before God for the salvation of their flock should so openly have antagonized Socialism in Germany at a time when the Center itself was actively cooperating with the less radical Socialists in the conduct of the newly formed German Republic of that period.

The explanation is simple for those who have had the opportunity closely to study the events that then were taking place in Germany. The Center, in its cooperation, never for an instant ceased to protest that it was inexorably opposed to the principles of Socialism. It was willing to cooperate with the Socialist Government officials towards all measures that were in reality Catholic, in so far as they had in view the common good of the entire country. Concessions, that did not involve a surrender of principles, they were willing to make, while countless important concessions for the common good were wrung from the Socialists in power. So, and so only, were they able to prevent a state of anarchy and the triumph of the most destructive radicalism. It was clearly the Center, with its vast proportion of Catholic members, that then saved Germany. As an illustration of the complete harmony of view between the Bishops of the country and responsible Centrist leaders on the question of Socialism, we may quote the words of the Centrist Deputy, Dr. Fassbender, that appeared in the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* for November 30, 1919:

In view of the ostensibly neutral, but in reality hostile attitude, programmatically assumed by Social Democracy (the German Socialist party) towards Christianity, no one need be surprised that the German Episcopate from the very outset looks with suspicion upon all resolutions of a legal nature which are passed under the preponderant influence of Social Democracy.

In Germany, as in many other countries, it has been, from first to last, a struggle on the part of loyal Catholics to save the Church from the destruction which, cunningly or brutally,

the Socialist International everywhere designed for her, whether under the propaganda of a false scientific materialism, or through taxation of Catholic schools, or in a direct attack upon her morality and her creed, or in a violent destruction of the very edifices built for her Divine worship. The philosophy of Socialism has everywhere been the same, a crass and discredited materialistic evolution applied to history, which Socialists themselves have significantly called "historic materialism" or "the materialistic conception of history." Socialism, the mental child of the atheistic Marx and Engels, can still, through all its growth and outward change of dress and habits, be easily recognized for their own. Such, in general, is the Socialist movement.

THE PASTORAL

BELoved BRETHREN:

The fearful seriousness of the hour compels us to address you again in a joint letter. Social democracy believes that amidst the present disturbances the hour has come to add to its efforts by also penetrating more deeply the ranks of the Catholic people. The Socialist propaganda is conducted in every direction, and even threatens many in our dioceses. One still hears continually the question: How stands Social Democracy in regard to Christianity and the Church? Therefore we must say a plain and definite word to you on the subject today.

"Christianity and Socialism have the same relationship to one another as fire and water." Thus has one of the most influential and competent spokesmen of Socialism expressly declared. He is in a position to know. In these words he confessed the full and undeniable truth. It is really so: Christianity and Socialism stand towards one another as fire and water. One cannot be at the same time a convinced follower of Socialism and a sincere (*aufrichtiger*) Catholic Christian. Either one or the other. The opposition and hostility of Socialism to Christianity and the Church are implacable.

The Socialist teaching stands in the strongest and sharpest contrast to our Catholic Christian creed. Socialism desires to use its strength to spread atheism, the denial of God, every-

where. In this endeavor all its leaders have been hitherto as one. That is to say, the fatal false teaching of Socialism is grounded on so-called materialism; it is inwardly and inseparably bound up with the materialist view of the world. Accordingly it offers nothing at all spiritual, nothing eternal, nothing unchangeable. Everything is matter; everything is temporal; everything ends with death; everything that exists is in continuous, changeful fluctuation. Note, dear brethren, that this is the ground dogma of Socialism. You see at once then that there is no room for God, there is no immortality. Then also there is no God-Man, Jesus Christ; no Divine Saviour, no salvation. Then there is no Church, no Sacraments, no world beyond, no reunion after death, no everlasting hell and no eternal heaven. Truly Socialist teaching and Catholic belief stand towards each other as fire and water.

Socialism also strives to shatter Catholic moral teaching and Catholic moral life. It proclaims that it in no way lays down eternal, unconditional, obligatory, general, indestructible moral precepts. It mocks the eternal God who has created men — and will one day judge them. It does not pray and, as you must have recognized yourselves lately, wishes to do away with prayer. It denies the other world, and requital there. It does not admit that there is a duty and responsibility of conscience which springs from God. Do not deceive yourselves in the matter: Socialism knows only of a life for this world, for the earth. The Commandments of God it wants to put away and abolish. According to Socialism, no one need any longer trouble about God and His law. But be assured, beloved brethren, "God is not mocked" (Gal. VI: 7) by any man! And it remains everlastingly true: "It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment" (Heb. IX: 27).

The State is to be separated from the school; the school is to be secular, that means without religion. For the State and the school, God and Church shall exist no longer. In the last joint pastoral, beloved brethren, we besought you for the love of Christ to consider what grievous wrong against God the Lord, against His Church, against suffering humanity, against your souls and against the innocent souls of your children is thus planned. We laid before you in all truth the danger

which arises from it for State and Church, for community and family. We warn and beseech you today again: Do not mistake the dreadful bearing of this Socialist movement. If Socialism succeeds, then — let people say what they will — your religion and freedom of conscience will be enslaved and gagged. The crucified Saviour will be banished shamefully, disgracefully from the sight of the public and from the schools.

The Socialists destroy Christian marriage and the Christian family. That this is aimed at, their leaders have often enough stated to everybody. They want to break the unity and indissolubility of Christian marriage. They desire to rob the family of the ordained relationship of husband and wife towards one another. They want to take away from parents the right to educate their children according to their convictions and their own conscience. The Sixth and Ninth Commandments are no longer to be in force. Thus the Socialist dares to violate God's holy law infamously. You clearly see that between Socialism and Christianity, no bridge is possible. But listen further. Socialism desires equal rights and duties for all men. That sounds well and fair, but nevertheless, make no mistake! There is then no longer in the family, in the school, in the State, or in society, any one who obeys for the sake of God and conscience. The Fourth Commandment, with all the duties attached thereto, for the variously organized arrangements of human society — the whole of the Fourth Commandment would be done away with.

SOCIALISM AND PRIVATE PROPERTY

And finally, you know that Socialism on principle wishes to do away with private property in the means of production, as, for instance, in land and soil, tools, machines, raw material, and the means of exchange (see the so-called Erfurt Program). These means of production are to be transferred to the possession of the State. Therefrom they promise themselves a gold mine. In this way they are to find the sure and inexhaustible source of good fortune and welfare for all men. Beloved brethren, do not allow yourselves to be deluded by these schemes of Socialism. Its actual working would lead to a cruel and fatal deception for the great masses of the people. Industry

and trade, handicrafts and business pursuits, instead of flourishing, would lose their vital strength. Afterwards there would be, just as there is today, a crowd of poor, unfortunate, suffering men who, with anxiety, have to fight for their existence and are allotted to the help of others. And bear this well in mind. The whole plan is un-Christian and goes against the dispensation of God. The Creator gave man the right of private property with human nature. And the dispensation and development in human society willed by God, requires the possession and dominion of private property in the same way. The Seventh Commandment expressly says: "Thou shalt not steal." In the Tenth Commandment inordinate desire is forbidden: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, nor his field, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is his." No man is entitled on principle to deny his fellow-man the right to private property or to rob him of it. That is the teaching of Christ, our God and Saviour; it is the teaching of the Apostles; it has been the teaching of the Catholic Church from the days of the Fathers in the beginning to the time of Leo XIII and his famous Encyclical on the social question. And never, you may be sure, will the Church allow the difference between *mine* and *thine* to be confused or effaced. Undoubtedly the possessor, by reason of his possession, has social duties, serious and great duties, duties both towards the non-possessors and also towards the community. The idea of social responsibility, as the Church proclaimed it, took root generally at first in humanity. Whoever wishes to bear testimony to the truth must admit that the Church has always been the most zealous advocate of all just social demands, particularly of the working classes. And never has the Church disputed, that, the law of justice being observed, the State may interfere with private property for the promotion of the public welfare. Yet in this connection it must be insisted that it is unjust and unlawful to wish to do away with private property in all the so-called means of production. Such a proposal is irreconcilably opposed to Christian teaching and the Christian law.

Beloved brethren, do not allow yourselves to be misled by the shibboleth: The Social Democrats treat religion as a

private affair. That is only an effort to create a disposition favorable to Socialism in the circles of those whom the true view of Socialism, and its embittered enmity towards religion, would frighten off to too large an extent. That shibboleth is merely a mask, a disguise. Innumerable testimonies in the writings and the life of the Socialists, innumerable expressions of a raging hatred of God and foul mockery of religion, declare often and loudly that Socialism is an irreconcilable opponent of Christianity and the Church. And do not doubt this: Between the different groups in Socialism — the Independents and the Majority Socialists — there is in this respect no difference. It does not matter at all that many who profess adherence to Social Democracy allege that they consider themselves good Catholics. Whoever promotes Socialism works against religion. Whoever supports Socialism, immediately or mediately, by his own action or through negligence or sloth, sins against Christ and His Church. Whoever holds to Christ and His Church cannot hold with Socialism. Either one — or the other. It is as that Socialist leader said, "Christianity and Socialism are to one another as fire and water."

Beloved brethren, you know your duty, and we firmly trust in your Catholic fidelity. Let each of you repeat in these decisive days his holy baptismal vows:

"Firm my baptismal vows shall bind
To the truth the Church is preaching.
In me a son she'll always find
Obedient to her teaching.
Thanks to God who by His grace
Within the fold has given me place,
A fold I ne'er shall stray from."

- ✠ FELIX CARDINAL VON HARTMANN, Archbishop of Cologne.
- ✠ M. FELIX, Bishop of Treves.
- ✠ CHARLES JOSEPH, Bishop of Paderborn.
- ✠ JOHN, Bishop of Muenster.
- ✠ WILLIAM, Bishop of Osnabrueck.
- ✠ JOSEPH, Bishop of Hildesheim.

V. PAPERS BY THE EDITORS

1. A LIVING WAGE, BY REV. JOHN A. RYAN, D.D., LL.D.
2. THE RECONCILIATION OF CAPITAL AND LABOR, BY REV. JOHN A. RYAN, D.D., LL.D.
3. A CATHOLIC SOCIAL PLATFORM, BY REV. JOSEPH HUSSEIN, S.J., PH.D.

1. A LIVING WAGE¹

BY REV. JOHN A. RYAN, D.D., LL.D.

"A LIVING WAGE" forms the title of a chapter in Professor William Smart's *Studies in Economics*. This chapter was written in Scotland, November, 1893. In its opening sentences we are told: "The last few weeks have seen the birth of a new and attractive catchword. Before it has even been defined, it is already put forward as arguing a claim. . . . The expression 'living wage' seems to give a reason and a basis for a certain amount of wages. It has, accordingly, found its way into everyday language, and we may expect soon to find that the conception which it expresses has taken its place among the convictions of many."

In all probability, these sentences describe the origin of the phrase, "living wage." But the idea that it expresses goes back much farther than the summer of 1893. Because the idea is so much older than the expression, it has "taken its place among the convictions of many" to a far greater extent and with much more rapidity than Professor Smart expected when he wrote the words just quoted. Because the expression neatly and concretely sets forth the idea, it likewise has obtained a currency that the professor never anticipated. Both the idea and the expression owe their vogue and their popularity to the fact that they represent a fundamental principle of justice.

Although the idea of a living wage goes back at least to the early Middle Ages, it received its first systematic and authoritative expression in the Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, "On the Condition of Labor." This was published in May, 1891, something more than a year before the "catchword" was first heard in Great Britain. In that document the great pontiff flatly

¹ From *The Church and Socialism and Other Essays*. The University Press, Washington, D. C.

rejected the prevailing doctrine that wages fixed by free consent were always fair and just. This theory, he said, leaves out of account certain important considerations. It ignores the fundamental fact that the laborer is morally bound to preserve his life, and that his only means of fulfilling this duty is to be found in his wages. Therefore, concluded Pope Leo, "a workman's wages ought to be sufficient to maintain him in reasonable and frugal comfort." This proposition, he declared, is a "dictate of natural justice."

What is "reasonable comfort"? Evidently, it is something more than the conditions and essentials of mere existence. To have merely the means of continuing to live and to work is not to be in comfort. What degree of comfort is reasonable? To this question we could get a hundred different answers from as many different persons. Each of the one hundred might conceive reasonable comfort as that to which he had become accustomed, or that to which he aspired because it seemed to bring happiness to others. The reasonable comfort that the Pope had in mind is merely the reasonable minimum. It is that smallest amount which will satisfy right reason. One way of finding out how much is required by this standard is to consult the judgment of competent and fair-minded men. Another and more fundamental method is to interpret reasonable comfort in the light of man's nature and essential needs. These are the ends to which any degree of welfare is but a means. Man's nature and needs, therefore, should indicate the amount of goods that constitute the minimum measure of reasonable comfort.

Like every other human being, the wage-earner is a person, not a thing, nor a mere animal. Because he is a person, he has certain needs that are not felt by animals, and his needs and his welfare have a certain sacredness that does not belong to any other species of creatures. A dog or a horse may be used as mere instruments to the welfare of man. They may rightfully be killed when man no longer wants them. Not so with the human person. He has intrinsic worth and dignity. He is made in the image and likeness of God. He is an end in himself. He was not created for the pleasure, or utility, or aggrandizement of any other human being or group of human

beings. His worth and his place in the universe are to be measured with reference to himself, not with reference to other men, or to institutions, or to states. He is worth while for his own sake.

When, then, are the needs to which are attached this prerogative of intrinsic worth and sacredness? How much of the good things of life must a man have in order that he may live in a manner worthy of a person? In general, he must have sufficient goods and opportunities for the exercise of all his faculties and the development of his personality. On the physical side, this means food, clothing and housing adequate to maintain him in health and working efficiency. If he is underfed, or insufficiently clothed, or improperly housed, he is treated with even less consideration than wise and humane men extend to their beasts of burden. Since the worker is not merely an animal and an instrument of production, but an intellectual and moral person, he requires the means of exercising and developing the faculties of his soul. Therefore he needs some education, some facilities for reading and study, the means of practicing religion, an environment that will not make unreasonably difficult the leading of a moral life, and sufficient opportunities of social intercourse and recreation to maintain him in efficiency and to give him that degree of contentment that is essential to a healthy outlook on life. As regards the future, the worker requires a certain minimum amount of security against sickness, accident, and old age. Finally, all these goods should be available to the worker, not as a single man, but as the head of a family; for marriage is among the essential needs of the great majority.

All the foregoing goods and opportunities are included in the concept of reasonable comfort. Within the last few years, many groups of persons have attempted to translate these requisites into more concrete symbols. They have tried to describe reasonable comfort or a decent livelihood in terms of food, housing, insurance, etc. Their statements and estimates have shown a remarkable measure of agreement. This substantial uniformity proves that "reasonable comfort," is not only a practical and tangible conception, but one that springs from the deepest intuitions of reason and morality.

We pass over their specific statements concerning the amount

and kinds of food required, as these are too technical for our present purpose. It is sufficient to say that these specifications cover an allowance of food adequate to the preservation of health and working efficiency. As regards clothing, the estimates include not merely what is needed for health and efficiency, but those additional articles and changes of raiment which are essential in order that the worker and his family may, without loss of self-respect, attend church, school, and participate in public gatherings, and various forms of social intercourse. The provision of apparel for these latter purposes may not be directly necessary on the ground of health, but it meets one of the fundamental needs of a human being. It is among the requirements of the mind and the emotions. To deny it to a man is to treat him as somewhat less than a man.

In the matter of housing, the authorities agree that the wage-earner and his family require at least four or five rooms, with adequate sunlight, ventilation, and all the elementary requisites of sanitation, and in moral and healthful surroundings.

The majority of social students believe that the workingman's wife should not be compelled to become a wage-earner, and that his children should not regularly engage in gainful occupations before the age of sixteen. If these conditions are not realized, the family is not living in reasonable comfort, and its younger members are deprived of reasonable opportunities of education and development.

All the members of the family should have some provision for recreation, such as an occasional trip to the country and visits to moving pictures or concerts, some access to books and periodical literature, in addition to schooling for the children up to the age of sixteen; and of course the means of belonging to a church.

The worker should have sufficient insurance against unemployment, accidents, sickness and old age to provide himself and those normally dependent upon him with all the above mentioned goods during those periods when he is unable to make such provision by his labor and wages.

Such are the requisites of reasonable comfort as determined by man's nature and needs, and as interpreted by all competent authorities on the subject. That the wage-earner, as all

other persons, ought to have this much of the good things of life will not be denied by anyone who appreciates the dignity and intrinsic worth of personality. The man who would assert that the worker and his family may reasonably be deprived of these things must logically contend that the worker may be killed or deprived of his liberty for the benefit of others. For the rights of life, liberty, marriage and all the other fundamental goods rest on precisely the same basis as the claim to reasonable comfort. That basis is the inherent sacredness of personality. This sacredness is outraged, not only when the person is killed, crippled, or imprisoned, but also when he is prevented from exercising and developing his faculties to a reasonable degree.

Pope Leo XIII declared that the workman's claim to a wage that provides reasonable comfort is a "dictate of natural justice." That is to say, a living wage and reasonable comfort are not merely desirable advantages, goods which we should all like to see possessed by the working man and his family, things necessary for reasonable life, but they are required by the principles of justice; they belong to him as a right. To a large proportion of employers, and to many other persons, this is still "a hard saying." How can it be justified?

Pope Leo could not present an extended justification in a document that dealt with the whole field of industrial relations. Hence he contented himself with laying down the general principle that a living wage and a condition of reasonable comfort are required in order that the wage earner may fulfill his duties of life and self-development. Obligations cannot be discharged without the necessary means; for the laborer, wages are the only means.

The latest ethical defence of the right to a living wage is that presented by the Rev. Dr. Cronin, in the second volume of his *Science of Ethics*. It is, in brief, that a wage which is not sufficient to provide reasonable comfort is not the just equivalent of the wage-earner's labor. Why? Because the worker's energy or labor is the one means that God has given him to provide the essentials of reasonable life and comfort. When the employer appropriates to his own uses this energy, he is bound in strict justice to give in exchange for it that amount of wel-

fare which the laborer's energy is the divinely given means of obtaining. Other writers give other arguments and justifications. Among the Catholic authorities the differences in this matter are differences of view-point rather than of principle. The following argument seems to be more fundamental and thorough than some of the others.

When we consider man's position in relation to the bounty of nature, we are led to accept three fundamental principles. The first may be thus stated: Since the earth was intended by God for the support of all persons, all have essentially equal claims upon it, and essentially equal rights of access to its benefits. On the one hand, God has not declared that any of His children have superior or exceptional claims to the earth. On the other hand, all persons are made in the image and likeness of God, composed of the same kind of body and soul, affected by the same needs, and destined for the same end. Therefore they are all equally important in His sight. They are all equally persons, endowed with intrinsic worth and dignity, ends in themselves, not instruments to the welfare of others. Hence they stand upon an essentially equal footing with regard to the animal, plant, and mineral bounty of the earth. This bounty is a common gift, possession, heritage. The moral claims upon it held by these equal human persons are essentially equal. No man can vindicate for himself a superior claim on the basis of anything that he finds in himself, in nature or in the designs of nature's God.

Nevertheless, this equal right of access to the earth is not absolute. It is conditioned upon labor, upon the expenditure of useful and fruitful energy. As a rule, the good things of the earth are obtained in adequate form and quantity only at the cost of considerable exertion. And this exertion is for the most part irksome, of such a nature that men will not perform it except under the compulsion of some less agreeable alternative. The labor to which the earth yields up her treasures is not put forth spontaneously and automatically. Therefore, the equal and inherent right of men to possess the earth and utilize its benefits becomes actually valid only when they are willing to expend productive energy and labor. This is the second fundamental principle.

Obviously we are speaking here of the original rights of men to the earth, not of those rights which they have acquired through the possession of private property. The rights in question are those which inhere in all men, whether or not they are private owners.

From the two principles of equal right of access to the earth, and universal obligation to perform a reasonable amount of useful labor, follows a third fundamental principle. It is that men who at any time or in any way control the resources of the earth are morally bound to permit others to have access thereto on reasonable terms. Men who are willing to work must be enabled to make real and actual their original and equal right of access to the common bounty of nature. For the right to subsist from the earth implies the right actually to participate in its benefits on reasonable conditions and through reasonable arrangements. Otherwise the former right is a delusion. To refuse any man reasonable facilities to exercise his basic right of living from the common bounty by his labor is to treat this right as non-existent. Such conduct by the men who are in possession implies a belief that their rights to the gifts of God are inherently superior to the right of the person whom they exclude. This position is utterly untenable. It is on exactly the same basis as would be the claim of a strong man to deprive a weak one of liberty. The right to freedom of movement is not more certain nor more indestructible than the right of access on reasonable terms to the bounty of the earth. Were a community to imprison an innocent man it would not violate his rights more vitally than does the proprietor or the corporation that deprives him of reasonable access to the resources of nature. In both cases the good that he seeks is a common gift of God.

This, then, is the moral basis underlying the laborer's right to a living wage. Like all other men, he has an indestructible right of access to the goods of the earth on reasonable terms. Obviously, the conditional clause, "on reasonable terms," is of very great importance. Neither the laborer nor anyone else has a right of direct and unconditional access to those portions of the earth that have rightly become the property of others. Such a claim would be the height of unreason. The laborer's

right to participate in the common heritage must be actualized in such a way as not to interfere with the equally valid rights of others. The laborer's right must be satisfied with due regard to existing acquired rights and the existing form of industrial organization.

From this principle to the principle that the laborer has a right to a living wage, the transition is logical and certain. Pope Leo XIII declared that the laborer's right to a living wage arises from the fact that his wage is his only means of livelihood. Owing to the manner in which the goods of the earth have been divided and appropriated in the present organization of industrial society, the wage-earner has no way of exercising his original and equal right of access to the earth except through the sale of his labor in return for wages. An occasional worker might get a livelihood by cultivating a piece of land, but the cost is so great that only those can defray it who are already receiving more than living wages. If such an opportunity and alternative were general, the living wage would not be a practical question. Men would not hire themselves out for less than that amount when they could obtain a decent livelihood by employing themselves on a piece of land. To assure a laborer that if he does not like to work for less than living wages, he can fall back upon his right of access to the earth by taking up a piece of land, is but to mock him. Such access as he has is evidently not access on reasonable terms.

For the wage-earner of to-day, therefore, access to the resources of nature can be had only through wages. The men who have appropriated the goods and opportunities of the earth have shut him out from any other way of entering upon his natural heritage. Therefore they are morally bound to use and administer these goods in such a way that his right shall not be violated and his access to the resources of nature not rendered unreasonably difficult. This means that the industrial community in which he lives, and for which he labors, shall provide him with the requisites of a decent livelihood in the form of living wages. On the one hand, the worker has performed a reasonable amount of labor; on the other hand, the industrial community is the beneficiary of his services. In the product which he has created the community has the

wherewith to pay him living wages. To refuse him this amount of remuneration is surely to deprive him of access to the earth and to a livelihood on reasonable terms.

It is assumed here that the laborer's product is sufficiently large to provide this much remuneration, and that the employer would rather pay it than go without the laborer's services. The case in which the product falls short of this sufficiency will be considered presently. If the employer does not think the laborer worth a living wage, he has a right to discharge him. Otherwise the employer would be treated unreasonably. But when the employer regards the employe as worth a living wage, but refuses to pay it merely because the laborer is economically constrained to work for less, he is surely treating the latter unreasonably. He is depriving the laborer of access to the goods of the earth on reasonable terms. In the striking words of Pope Leo XIII, he is making the laborer "the victim of force and injustice."

The reader will have noticed that in the last paragraph the word "employer" is substituted for the word "community," which was used in the paragraph preceding. If the community in its corporate civil form — that is, the State — were the direct beneficiary of the laborer's services, if it came into direct possession of the laborer's product, it would obviously be charged with the duty of paying him a living wage. In our present industrial organization, however, the state permits the employer to obtain the product and imposes upon him the duty of wage paying. Therefore he is the person who is obliged to perform this duty adequately, that is, in the form of living wages. If he fails to do so, he abuses his social and industrial functions; he uses his control over the goods of the earth in such a way as to deprive the laborer of access thereto on reasonable terms.

What if the employer cannot pay living wages? Space limitations will not permit us to discuss the very interesting ethical question whether such an employer is morally obliged to go out of business. The employer has a right to take from the product the equivalent of a decent livelihood for himself and his family, even though the remainder will not provide full living wages for all his employes. For his claim to a decent live-

lihood is as good as theirs, and in a conflict of equal claims a man is justified in preferring himself to his neighbors. When, however, the employer has already obtained a decent livelihood, he has no right to take from the product one cent more until he has given all his employes the full measure of living wages. In the first place, the right to take interest in any circumstances on invested capital is only presumptive and probable, not certain. In the second place, the right of the laborers to get from the joint product the means of satisfying their essential and fundamenal needs is morally superior to the right of the employer to the means of indulging in luxurious living or of making new investments. To deny this proposition is to assert that the claims of the laborers upon the common bounty of nature are morally inferior to those of the employer, and that they are but instruments to his welfare, not morally equal and independent persons.

One can easily imagine some employer exclaiming that a right of access to the resources of nature does not mean the right to take as much as the equivalent of a living wage. The objection ignores the truth that the access should be "on reasonable terms." Surely this phrase implies that the access and the wage should provide at least a decent livelihood. The employer who thinks that he may rightfully pay the lowest wage that the laborer can be forced to accept forgets that he himself is only a steward of the gifts of God. What he calls his product is his, not to use as he pleases, but to administer with due regard to the natural rights of his employes.

We have made no formal defense of the proposition that the just living wage for an adult male is one that will support decently his wife and children as well as himself. We have assumed that anyone who recognizes the claim of the laborer to develop his personality to a reasonable degree will take for granted that those advantages are possible only when the father's wage is adequate to decent family maintenance.

Up to the present we have given no more specific definition of a living wage than it is the equivalent of a decent livelihood, or a sum sufficient to maintain the worker and his family in conditions of reasonable comfort. The attempt to define it in terms of money is beset with many difficulties. Some housekeepers

are much better managers than others in making purchases and in utilizing them; the number and quantity of concrete goods that suffice for decent living conditions, for example, in the matters of recreation and non-material things, do not easily submit to exact measurement; the variation in the cost of commodities from city to city and from section to section renders any single estimate inadequate; and, finally, the recent extraordinary rise in prices, culminating in the present abnormal cost of living, has made almost all previous estimates antiquated.

Nevertheless, the difficulties are not insurmountable. They can be overcome sufficiently to yield approximate estimates that will be of great practical value. That is all that we require in a matter of this kind. We are dealing with the realm of moral approximations, not with the province of exact science. While the cost of living of a workingman's family varies indefinitely on account of the varying proficiency of the housewife, we have to consider only the average level of domestic economy and efficiency. This average is ascertainable quite as definitely as a hundred other important social facts. The goods that are required to provide a minimum decent level of existence can be estimated with sufficient accuracy to safeguard the welfare of the laborer and his family. The variation of prices over space and time can be dealt with by making the estimates of a living wage apply only to specific places and specific dates.

Within recent years we have been provided with many such estimates. For example, the New York Bureau of Standards concluded in 1915 that the minimum cost of living for a family of five was a little less than \$850 annually. In the same year a commission of members of the legislature gave an estimate of about \$875 for the same city and about \$100 less for Buffalo. In the summer of 1918 the experts of the National War Labor Board found that the lowest annual amount upon which a man and wife and three children could be maintained decently was \$1,386.

Four methods are conceivable by which a living wage might become universal. The first is the automatic operation of economic forces. Some twenty or twenty-five years ago this theory enjoyed considerable favor among economists. It took substantially this form: Capital is increasing much faster than labor;

therefore, its demand for labor is increasing relatively to the supply; therefore, the remuneration of labor will necessarily increase. The fatal flaw in this argument is its neglect of the fact that a large proportion of the new capital takes the place of labor, thereby reducing instead of enhancing the demand for laborers. Machines are constantly made to do the work of men, and so far as we can see, the process will go on indefinitely. The remuneration of underpaid labor measured by its purchasing capacity has decreased rather than increased during the last quarter of a century. No economic forces are discernible that are likely to cause a contrary movement within the next twenty-five years.

The second agency that might theoretically be expected to raise the wages of the underpaid is the benevolence of employers. Only visionaries put any faith in this method. In so far as experience is a guide, it warns us that only an insignificant minority of employers will ever voluntarily increase the remuneration of employes who are getting less than living wages. Were the number of those disposed to do so multiplied indefinitely, they would not be able to carry out their lofty design. Owing to the force and keenness of competition, the great majority of employers must conform to the wage standards fixed by their most selfish competitors. A benevolent majority might, indeed, raise wage rates to the level of decency by combining for that purpose. Our readers would not thank us for inviting them to consider seriously such a fantastic hypothesis.

The third conceivable method is that of organization by the laborers themselves. While labor unions have done much, very much, to increase wages within the last forty years, their influence in this field has been mainly restricted to the skilled trades. The proportion of unskilled and underpaid labor enrolled in the unions has always been very small, and it shows very little tendency to increase. Effective organization requires time, patience and considerable financial resources, the very things which underpaid labor lacks. Not within a generation would organization be able to obtain living wages for more than a minority of those who are below that level.

The one device that gives promise of making the living wage

universal is a minimum fixed by law. This means that the public authorities, state or federal, or both, should enact legislation forbidding any employer to pay less than the equivalent of a decent livelihood.

2. THE RECONCILIATION OF CAPITAL AND LABOR¹

BY REV. JOHN A. RYAN, D.D., LL.D.

"THE great mistake made in the matter now under consideration, is to take up with the notion that class is naturally hostile to class, and that the wealthy and the workingmen are intended by nature to live in mutual conflict. So irrational and so false is this view that the direct contrary is the truth. . . . Each needs the other. Capital cannot do without labor, nor labor without capital."

These words occur in the encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, "On the Condition of Labor." They are not only true in general, but they have a specific bearing upon the strained relations now existing between large sections of the employing class and large sections of the class of wage-earners. They can be logically denied only by the Socialist. In the mind of the man who believes that the wage system is essentially unjust, or at least doomed to inevitable destruction through irrepressible class warfare, there is evidently no room for the doctrine that capital and labor have common interests. With this theory we do not mean to deal in these pages, except to write down our conviction that it is wrong morally and unsound economically. On the other hand, the view that the community of interest doctrine has no practical value, is a superficial and one-sided view. We hope to show that Pope Leo's statement is not only true in the abstract, but capable of fruitful application to our present industrial conditions. The formula of industrial harmony can be translated into effective rules for the guidance of employer and employee.

¹ From a pamphlet entitled "Capital and Labor: Methods of Cooperation and Harmony," published for the National Catholic Welfare Council by *The Sunday Visitor*, Huntington, Ind. Permission to reprint these parts of the pamphlet is gratefully acknowledged.

LABOR PARTICIPATION IN MANAGEMENT

The indispensable first step is to make the worker more interested in his work, in its planning, its processes and its results. His industrial position must be so modified that he will find himself in some degree a partner in the enterprise, rather than a mere executor of orders, or animated instrument of production. Inherent in every normal person is the desire to exercise some controlling power over his material environment. Every normal person possesses some directive, initiating, creative capacity. Unless this capacity receives some opportunity for expression, the wage worker, like all other persons, remains uninterested in his task, and relatively inefficient. When the worker is enabled to exercise his directive and creative faculties, his interest is aroused and his efficiency is increased. The man who directs a business always works harder and more efficiently than his employee.

This fundamental and withal obvious fact of human nature has come to be strangely and generally ignored by the masters of our great industrial concerns. They act as though the worker were made of different clay. "A good deal is said about the worker's psychology," says Dr. Meeker, the United States Commissioner of Labor Statistics, "as though the worker were some strange, wild beast with a peculiar psychology all his own, quite different from the psychology of employers and managers. It is because the psychology of the worker is the same as the psychology of the employer and the manager that strikes and lockouts occur with such distressing frequency." Applying these observations to the matter that we are now considering, the Commissioner continues: "A man will willingly work much harder, expend much more energy, and be much less fatigued working on a job which he has a part in planning, and for the results of which he is responsible. The present-day movement for industrial democracy is a partial recognition of the fundamental psychological phenomenon that industrial fatigue is not simply an engineering question, to be stated mathematically in foot-pounds per hour, or even a physiological question having to do with calories burned up in the body. Work is hard primarily because it is uninteresting, or easy because it demands ingenuity or skill. . . .

The worker must be called upon to use his head in planning as well as his hands and feet in executing his work if contentment is to be attained in industry." (*The Monthly Labor Review*, Feb., 1920, pp. 3, 4).

The problem of enlisting the interest and efficiency of the worker through the exercise of his directive and creative faculties has two distinct aspects. There is the question of individual technical interest, of stimulating the worker's ingenuity and initiative in relation to the particular industrial process or task upon which he is engaged. The object here is primarily to eliminate monotony, routine and fatigue. While the question of securing and maintaining the technical interest of the worker is of fundamental importance, it will not be further considered here; for it is at once more difficult and less pertinent to our general subject than the problem of arousing the worker's managerial interest and capacity. The former is a technical problem, a problem for the industrial engineer; the problem making the worker more interested in his work by enabling him to participate in the management of the whole shop or concern, is one that can be solved by the exercise of common sense and good will, and it has a direct and very great bearing upon the question of bringing about greater cooperation between capital and labor.

In modern industry, where the operation of an industrial unit requires the concerted action of many persons, the exercise of directive capacity by the worker can be obtained only through organization and cooperation. The question is not whether the worker shall be an employee, or the manager of a small shop or a small farm. It is whether he shall be a mere executer of orders, or whether he shall *participate*, in common with his fellow workers, in some of the operations of management. "Participation in management" is, indeed, a vague phrase, and it means many different things to different persons. As we employ it here, it implies at once something less and something more than it conveys to the average man who has given the subject only passing consideration. As a rule, it does not and should not include either the commercial or the financial operations of a business. The workers are not competent nor eager to take part in the processes of buying materials, finding a

market for and selling the product, borrowing money, or financing extensions of the enterprise. It is mainly in the industrial or productive department of a business that labor participation in management can become beneficial to employees and employers. On the other hand, it means something more than a share in direction of such matters as safety, sanitation, benefit funds and welfare activities generally. In addition to these subjects, and in addition to the subjects of wages, hours, shop conditions and shop discipline, there are such questions as the engagement, transfer and discharge of employees; the continuous application of shop rules and working agreements; the training of apprentices; the supply of work; the introduction of new machinery; the improvement of industrial processes and organization; industrial experiments; and scientific management.

The first half dozen of these subjects have been brought to a greater or less degree under the control of the workers in many establishments which make no pretense of exemplifying labor participation in management. They all concern conditions of employment and relations with the employer. While they are an essential element in labor participation, they are not the more important and distinctive element. The last four or five activities mentioned in the list describe the greater part of what is new and novel in the conception. They involve some exercise of industrial and technical direction. And they differ from those devices for arousing the technical interest of the individual worker in his task, to which brief reference was made above, because they have to do with the productive organization as a whole. "There is a vast gulf fixed," says Commissioner Meeker, "between expressing an opinion about the shape of the handle of a shovel one uses for heaving slag, or the desirability of having a glee club rather than a debating society, and the planning and routing of work, devising methods and determining upon tools, machines and processes for making the finished product in a big plant." (*Idem*, p. 12.)

The general principle underlying the demand for labor participation in management is that the workers should have a share in the control of all those conditions and processes which affect them directly or appreciably, and about which they pos-

sess some helpful knowledge. The latter consideration is almost as important as the former, and yet it has been strangely ignored by the great majority of employers. Proceeding upon the autocratic assumption that the workers are fit only to be dependent units, animated instruments, of production, they have deprived themselves of the technical advice and cooperation which they might have obtained from the rank and file of their employees. After all, the active contact of the latter with technical processes and shop organization may fairly be presumed to give them some distinctive competency and a distinctive viewpoint. These should have some value in the operation and management of the concern. "I insist that the management, even scientific management, has not a monopoly of all the brains in an establishment. . . . As a worker and a student, I feel that there is a tremendous latent creative force in the workers of today which is not being utilized at all. . . . Here is a vast source of industrial power which has been cut off, isolated, by the transformation of little business into big business. It will be difficult to tap this source, but tap it we must if we are to continue anything resembling the present industrial organization with its large scale production. The good will of the workers is a much more potent force making for industrial efficiency than all the scientific management formulas and systems of production. There is no inherent reason why the good will of the workers should not go hand in hand with scientific management. Until now the workers have had only antagonism for scientific management because the scientific manager never asked them for their opinions or ideas,—he only told them what they were expected to do, and the workers promptly did something else. I have already said workers are not different from employers. That is precisely what ails them. If employers will only deal fairly and squarely with their employees, let them know all about the business except those technical processes which must be kept secret, and take them into a real partnership, production will be enormously improved both in quantity and quality." (*Ibid.*)

Dr. Meeker might have added that those employers who have had any considerable experience with the scheme of labor participation in management, are practically unanimous in affirm-

ing its manifold advantages. After listening for more than two months to the testimony and opinions of persons representing every interest in the field of industry, the President's Second Industrial Conference made this statement: "The Conference finds that joint organization of management and employees, where undertaken with sincerity and good will, has a record of success."

The manifold benefits that may with assurance be expected from the arrangement can be thus summarized: The directive and creative faculties of the workers are brought into action; the workers acquire greater consciousness of their dignity and increased self-respect; with this energizing consciousness, and with the actual exercise of some control over the human relations and the industrial processes of the institution in which they spend their active lives, there comes to the workers some sense of responsibility, of accountability, for the welfare and progress of the business; their new status makes them not only more interested in their work, but more contented and more kindly disposed toward the employer; the merely business relation between employer and employee is supplanted by something like a human relation, which makes them more like partners and less like antagonists; the employer finds that both his pecuniary welfare and his peace of mind have been enhanced; and the whole community is the gainer through a larger and more efficient production.

THE SHOP COMMITTEE

The particular forms of organization through which labor participation in management is effectuated, exhibit considerable variety. The main types are about half a dozen. In all of them the essential and fundamental arrangement is the shop committee, which is composed of equal numbers of persons representing the employees and the management. This joint association meets regularly and frequently to deal with all matters of common interest in the productive department of the business.

The objections to the shop committee by employers are mainly two. One of these springs from an autocratic desire to "man-

age their business as they see fit"; that is, a disinclination to share the exercise of industrial control with anyone, least of all, with their employees. This attitude is logically impossible, since every employer's control is limited to some extent by the fact that his employees are not slaves but freemen whose services he can obtain only by the method of contract. In these conditions the practical question for the employer is not whether he will exercise unlimited power over all the features of the business, but how much power it is wise to share with his employees. And the answer to that question is that an enlightened employer will permit and even encourage his employees to share in the management to whatever extent is conducive to the well being of the business.

In the second place, many employers refuse to believe that the rank and file of the workers possess any capacity for participation in management. To this contention there are two replies. First, the theory that the industrial population is divided into two sharply distinguished classes, the supermen at the top who only are capable of exercising directive power, and the masses at the bottom who are utterly devoid of such ability, is as false in industry as in politics. It has been discredited in the latter sphere, and there is no sufficient reason for assuming that it is either true or destined to endure in the domain of industry. The difference between the ability required to govern politically and that needed to manage an industrial concern, is one of degree, not of kind. In any case, it will not be permanently possible to maintain industry in a political democracy upon a basis of despotism and feudalism. The second answer to the employer's distrust of the managerial capacity of the workers is that only a small proportion of any labor force need be given the opportunity of participating in management, and that even these have to be educated to the function gradually. What is immediately desirable is not that the arrangement be introduced with any given degree of rapidity, but that it be deliberately and honestly accorded a sympathetic trial. Success will not come without the exercise of great patience by all persons concerned.

The shop committee ought to appeal especially to those employers who desire to be fair to labor, but who regard the trade

union as a great source of friction and as an obstacle to the success of all attempts to arouse the interest of the worker in the welfare of the concern in which he is employed. A shop committee that functioned satisfactorily would necessarily compel the workers to regard with a friendly feeling and with some sense of responsibility the business in whose management they had some share. The consciousness of cooperation and common interests between them and their employer would become something real and vital.

From this consideration we are naturally led to consider the objections of the trade unions. They fear that shop committee will degenerate into "company unions"; that is, organizations dominated by the employer.

One answer to this assumption is that no form of labor association can remain long under the control of the employer, or of any other power than the members themselves; a second answer is that the shop committee should be maintained in frank cooperation with the regular labor union. It is not a substitute for the latter. It has distinct functions of its own; for example, the negotiation and enforcement of standard terms of wages and other conditions of employment throughout a whole industry. The shop committee deals only with employment relations in a single plant or establishment, is particularly concerned with details which cannot be effectively handled by the union, and must hold sessions much more frequently than the joint conferences between the union and the employers for an entire industry. Therefore, there is no reason why the shop committee should intrude upon the field that belongs to the union, even in the matter of working conditions and employment relations. And the domain of labor participation in industrial management, the relation of the workers to industrial processes and organization, is entirely outside the scope of the union.

Some day the relations between capital and labor may have become so satisfactory that the shop committee and the larger industrial council will be the only form of organization required for the protection of the workers; but that day is still far in the future. Until it arrives, the shop committee can only supplement, not supplant, the union; and every true friend of the

shop committee will frankly recognize the necessity of harmonious cooperation between the two forms of association.

STATEMENT OF THE PRESIDENT'S INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE

The declarations of the Conference on labor participation in management, under the title, "employee representation," are significant for several reasons. First, because the members of the Conference are in the main either employers of labor or professional men who have the viewpoint of the employer rather than of the employee; second, because the members were unanimous in making these declarations, and all others as well, which appear in the Report, and, third, because of the strong approval given to the position that both employers and trade unionists ought to welcome labor participation in management. Following are the most significant paragraphs on this subject:

It cannot be denied that unrest today is characterized more than ever before by purposes and desires which go beyond the mere demand for higher wages and shorter hours. Aspirations inherent in this form of restlessness are to a great extent psychological and intangible. They are not for that reason any less significant. They reveal a desire on the part of workers to exert a larger and more organic influence upon the processes of industrial life. This impulse is not to be discouraged but made helpful and cooperative. With comprehending and sympathetic appreciation, it can be converted into a force working for a better spirit and understanding between capital and labor, and for more effective cooperation.

The idea of employee representation has aroused opposition from two sources. On the one hand, in plants too large for direct personal contact, employers who still adhere to the theory that labor is a commodity, hold off from any form of cooperation with employees. This view is steadily disappearing and will, it is hoped, wholly disappear. On the other hand, a number of trade union leaders regard shop representation as a subtle weapon directed against the union. This thought is apparently based on the fear that it may be used by some employers to undermine the unions. Conceived in that spirit no plan can be a lasting agency of industrial peace.

But occasional misuse of employee representation and the consequent hesitancy of organized labor to endorse it officially, are based on a misconception of the possible and desirable relations between the union and the shop committee. This relation is a complementary, and not a mutually exclusive one. In many plants the trade

union and the shop committee are both functioning harmoniously. In some establishments the men are unionized, and the shop committees are composed of union men. In others, some men belong to the trade union while all belong to the shop organization.

The union has had its greatest success in dealing with basic working conditions, and with the general level of wages in organized and partially organized industries and crafts. It has also indirectly exerted an influence on standards in unorganized trades. There is no reason to suppose that in the future this influence will not continue.

Local problems, however, fall naturally within the province of shop committees. No organization covering the whole trade and unfamiliar with special local conditions and the questions that come up from day to day, is by itself in a position to deal with these questions adequately, or to enlist the cooperation of employer and employee in methods to improve production and to reduce strain. Except for trades in which the union itself has operated under a system of employee representation, as it does in shipbuilding and in the manufacture of clothing and in other trades, these internal factors are likely either to be neglected or to be dealt with in a way which does not make for satisfactory cooperation.

The existence of employee representation in plants operating under union agreement does not necessarily reduce the scope of the union representative's work. But matters are more likely to come to him as questions of the application of an agreement rather than as a mere grievance. In other words he has greater opportunity for service in negotiation of an essentially conciliatory nature. The fortunate results of such development have been evident in industries in which employee representation and trade unions have for some time been functioning harmoniously.

PROFIT SHARING

All the advantages of Labor participation in management can be increased and supplemented by a system of labor sharing in surplus profits. These are the profits which remain after fair wages and all other expenditures have been paid, after sufficient reserves have been set aside to cover depreciation and maintenance, and after capital has received a dividend sufficient to provide the prevailing rate of interest and something in addition to meet the contingency of unprosperous years. This surplus should be divided between capital and labor on such a basis as would stimulate the interest and efficiency of the latter, with-

out decreasing the efficiency of the management. The plan is economically sound because it does not begin to function until capital has received the normal or average return which is sufficient to keep the business solvent and to attract new investments. In view of this circumstance, the objection sometimes urged against profit-sharing, that it does not compel the workers to share losses as well as gains, is entirely irrelevant. The worker is not required to share *general* or average losses for the very good reason that these are already offset and discounted in the rate of interest which capital is permitted to take before any profits are distributed. He is required to share those *special* losses which occur whenever there is no surplus to distribute. In these circumstances he receives the same treatment as the capitalist,—neither gets surplus profits. Both, however, obtain their normal returns, respectively, the regular rate of wages and the average rate of dividend. The fund to be divided in a profit sharing plan is not the general or average returns from a business, but the surplus that remains after all average charges are met. And this surplus would be in great part provided through the enhanced contentment and efficiency of the workers themselves.

The majority of profit sharing schemes have been unsuccessful for various and sufficient reasons. Sometimes they were introduced as substitutes for decent wages; sometimes they were used to keep the workers out of unions; and sometimes — frequently in fact — they have been so disproportionately favorable to capital as to yield the workers only insignificant additions to wages. In order to be effective a profit sharing plan must presuppose a wage scale equal to the highest prevailing, no interference with labor unions, and a more generous share of the surplus to labor than has been the general practice heretofore. The most liberal division is on the basis of the total fixed dividend payment and the total wage payment. The least liberal is that which takes the total investment as the basis of the share of capital, retaining total wages as the determinant of the share of labor. Another arrangement divides the surplus equally between capital and labor, regardless of the relations which capital investment bears to the payroll.

This is more generous than the second plan, but less generous than the first.

As in the case of labor participation in management, so in the matter of profit sharing, the right of labor to organize and to bargain collectively must be honestly preserved. At least, such must be the policy for many years yet. Until these new institutions have become general, well established and successful, the workers cannot afford to give up the labor union.

The long discussion of these devices in the foregoing pages has been dictated by the conviction that a considerable change in the industrial status of labor and in the relations between labor and capital, is inevitable. Labor will insist upon the change, and capital will in the long run profit by willingly acquiescing. Society cannot afford to permit the indefinite continuation of the present conditions of industrial friction and uncertainty, inadequate production and social waste. Cooperation and partnership between the two great industrial groups must take the place of conflict and dependence. The most effective means to these ends seem to be labor sharing in management and in profits. They appear adequate to bring into operation and realization all those motives and interests which are common to labor and capital, and all these principles of action which will promote the common good. So far as we can now see, the only alternative is some species of destructive radicalism.

DIVERGENT INTERESTS

So much for the common interests of the two industrial parties. These apply only to those processes and relations which are involved in the *making* of the product. As regards the *division* of the product, the interests of capital and labor are mutually opposed. Obviously the problem of reconciling conflicting interests is more difficult than that of giving effect to common interests. While labor participation in management and profit sharing would considerably soften the conflict over the division of the product, it would not and could not solve the problem. "So long as the capitalist regards wages as a necessary cost, so long as the worker regards interest, rent and profits as deductions from the wealth that he creates, that

unsettled question is a flaming sword which cleaves their interests apart." (*Labor in the Changing World*, p. 126.)

Moreover, some approach to a satisfactory adjustment of this problem would be a powerful impetus toward the adoption of the devices for more harmonious relations in the process of production. Unless men are fairly well satisfied with their wages, they will have little inclination for or faith in labor sharing in management and in profits.

The most effective means of diminishing the antagonistic elements in the relations between capital and labor is religion and the moral principles inculcated by religion, especially the principles of justice. This statement is particularly true of the division of the product. Since neither physical nor economic force is an acceptable rule of division, the only recourse is to the rule of right. How, according to this rule, should the product be divided between labor and capital? An adequate answer to this question will not be attempted, for two reasons: first, it would take up too much space; second, it is beyond the present writer's ability. All that we can do here, and all that is necessary, is to set forth some of the most fundamental and most evident conclusions of justice that apply to the situation.

JUSTICE IN THE DIVISION OF THE PRODUCT

In order to make the discussion as concrete as possible, let us consider a manufacturing corporation. The first and most fundamental moral principle to be kept in mind is that all persons have a right of access on reasonable terms and conditions to the earth's sources of livelihood. This is the primary right of property. Therefore, all the workers in this manufacturing establishment, from the day laborer to the executive officer, who perform a reasonable day's work have a right to at least so much of the product as will enable them to live decently, in a manner becoming to human beings. Because they are persons they have a *right* to live from the common bounty of God; because they are persons they have likewise a right to a *decent* livelihood from the common store. "If through necessity or the fear of a worse evil," says Pope Leo XIII, "the workman accept harder conditions because an employer or contractor will afford him no better, he is the victim of force and injustice."

Some members of the working force have a right to more than this minimum of decent living. The executive officers, the superintendents, and in general all those who perform directive functions, have a just claim to something additional, for two reasons: first, because many of them have expended time and money in the process of fitting themselves for their present tasks; second, because they have become accustomed to a standard of living above the minimum, and would suffer undue hardships if they were compelled to decline to a lower level. Among the workers who do not perform directive functions, there are likewise some who have a right to something more than the minimum remuneration that will afford decent support: those who are engaged upon exceptionally disagreeable, arduous or hazardous tasks; those who produce more than the average worker; and those whose preparation for their present occupations involved the expenditure of time and money.

What about the stockholders who take no active part in the operation of the business, in the making of the product? In spite of the difficulties which surround this question, we may answer for practical purposes that these stockholders may, for both social and industrial reasons, properly claim at least the prevailing or competitive rate of interest on their investment; that is, the rate which is obtained generally from investments subject to the degree of risk that affects this corporation. Those stockholders who are actively employed in the business have also a claim to this interest-return, in addition to the remuneration that they receive for their labor.

Suppose that the product is not large enough to satisfy all these claims; that is, living wages for all the workers, additional rewards for those who have special claims, as described above, and the prevailing rate of interest for the owners of capital. In such a case the claims of the stockholders to interest give way before the wage-claims of the active members of the concern. The stockholders have other means of livelihood than their interest-incomes,—they have their capacity to work. Therefore, the needs which they will satisfy through the receipt of interest, are less important in the moral order, in the human order, than the needs of the workers, the needs which are dependent upon wages. If the workers are compelled to accept less than living

wages in order that the stockholders may obtain the normal rate of interest, the elementary needs of the former, their need of food, clothing and shelter, will be accounted less important than the desires of the stockholders to enjoy life's luxuries and superfluities. This is a manifestly irrational distribution of the common product among persons who are essentially equal in human dignity and in their claims to a reasonable amount of the goods and opportunities which God has provided for all His children. Therefore, justice requires that the owner of capital should not receive interest until all the workers have obtained remuneration equivalent to a decent livelihood.

Have all the employees a right to something more than mere living wages? Have all those who deserve extra remuneration on account of unusual hazards, productivity, cost of preparation, etc., a right to something more than the surplus compensation which will exactly meet these special conditions? We do not know how to answer either of these questions. If more than the equitable minimum is given to either of these classes, it will come from either the consumer or the capitalist. With regard to the former, it is impossible to lay down any general rule. It is impossible to show that the consumer is or is not obliged to pay prices sufficiently high to provide all the workers with something more than the equitable minimum. On the other hand, it seems reasonable that such extra compensation should not be given to the workers by depriving the capitalist of the normal rate of interest. If the capitalist is already in receipt of this measure of return, and there exists a surplus which might go to either the owners of capital or the laborers, it would seem that the latter ought to be preferred; for it is impossible to prove that the capitalist, merely as capitalist, ever has a strict right to interest in excess of the prevailing rate. A division of the surplus between all the workers and all the owners of capital would not be inequitable, and would be industrially and socially beneficial. The features and advantages of this arrangement have been set forth at sufficient length on preceding pages. Probably the ideal plan, from the viewpoint of both equity and efficiency, would be to distribute the whole surplus among all who perform labor of any sort in the operation of the concern, whether they are or are not at the same time stockholders. In

this way the surplus gains would go to those who have labored to produce them, and the efficiency and productivity of all would be stimulated to the maximum.

JUSTICE IN THE CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT

Closely connected with wages as a cause of divergent interest between capital and labor, is the length of the working day. Within certain limits, the capitalist is interested in a long day, the laborer in a short one. As a rule, the former makes a larger profit when the working day is ten hours than when it is six hours, or even eight, while the worker obtains greater ease and leisure from the shorter period. To this extent their interests in this matter are mutually antagonistic. How can this conflict be reconciled on principles of justice? Perhaps a sufficient general answer will be found in the declarations of Pope Leo XIII ("On the Condition of Labor"), "Daily labor should not be protracted over longer hours than strength admits"; this depends upon "the nature of the work, the circumstances of time and place, and the strength and health of the workman." In most urban industries these requirements would probably dictate a working day restricted to eight hours.

In the matters of safety, sanitation and moral safeguards, the interests of the employer and of the employee again come into conflict. Adequate provision to meet these needs imposes an expense upon the former, while the absence of such provision exposes the worker to physical and moral injury. Justice demands that the employer should furnish the appropriate protective devices in normal and reasonable measure.

THE NECESSITY OF ARBITRATION

Wages, hours, and shop conditions are, therefore, the chief sources of antagonism between the interests of capital and labor; and the principles of justice, as also of charity, are the fundamental and indispensable means of reconciling and composing these differences. When the two parties cannot agree concerning either the authority or the practical applications of these moral principles, there are two rational methods of adjustment which should be utilized before resort is had to either a strike or a lockout. One is direct negotiation between the

authorized representatives of the employer and the employee, as already described in the discussion of collective bargaining. When this method fails the next step should be arbitration. An impartial tribunal can practically always be obtained if both parties are in a reasonable frame of mind. To reject arbitration is to assume that justice can be ascertained and established by the preponderance of economic force. In a lockout or a strike it is always the economically stronger party that wins, not necessarily the one that has a just cause. A strike may fail or it may succeed; a lockout may fail or it may succeed: in all four events the question of justice remains quite as undetermined as before.

Nor is there any merit in the objection that the method of arbitration sometimes results in a miscarriage of justice. So it does; but in the words of the Pastoral Letter of the American Hierarchy, issued a few weeks ago: "No human institution is perfect or infallible; even our courts of law are sometimes in error. Like the law court, the tribunal of industrial arbitration provides the nearest approach to justice that is practically attainable; for the only alternative is economic force, and its decisions have no necessary relation to the decrees of justice."

Until recently the method of arbitration was rejected more frequently by capital than by labor, for the simple reason that capital felt itself to be the stronger. Of late labor has shown a disposition to imitate this tactic, this general weakness of human nature, because labor thinks that the preponderance of force has passed to its side. Obviously this policy is no more reasonable now than formerly, no more reasonable in the hands of labor than in those of capital.

The elaborate plan of legally authorized arbitration recommended in the recent Report of the President's Industrial Conference seems admirably calculated to provide adequate methods of adjusting disputes. Both parties are assured fair and competent representation on the arbitration tribunals, and the public interests are safeguarded by the inclusion of as much compulsion as is feasible.

JUSTICE AND PEACE

Pope Leo XIII closes his outline of the mutual rights and duties of employer and employee with this question: "Were these precepts carefully obeyed and followed out, would they not of themselves be sufficient to keep under all strife and all its causes?" (Encyclical "On the Condition of Labor.") In the preceding pages we have done nothing more than to attempt a detailed application of the great Pontiff's precepts and principles, and to present a few practical methods of making them effective in the industrial situation of the United States. To these methods and recommendations we take the liberty of applying the question just quoted. Socialists, as we are well aware, would return a negative answer. Indeed, they would reject outright the Pope's assumption that the abolition of industrial strife is desirable. For they hold that there exists a necessary and irrepressible conflict between capital and labor, which can be ended only through the abolition of private capital. We who repudiate this social and economic philosophy believe that the interests of capital and labor are in part identical and in part antagonistic. We believe that their common interests can be emphasized and their diverse interests minimized to such an extent that both will in the long run reap from the policy immense advantages. We believe that this outcome is attainable through the exercise of a moderate amount of intelligence, good will, and mutual sympathy. It is easily possible for any employer and any group of workers to put into effect the principles and proposals described in the foregoing pages. In a few instances one or the other party would obtain less material advantages than through the methods of industrial warfare, but even these exceptional individuals and groups would be more than compensated in terms of the higher goods of life. In the great majority of cases, both capital and labor would be better off materially and spiritually. The solid advantages that would accrue to the community as a whole do not require detailed statement.

The great obstacles to the acceptance of this program are ignorance and selfishness. A very large proportion of both employers and employees do not realize that the way of peace and

mutual consideration is also the way of genuine expediency. They are ignorant on this point simply because they have never given the matter a reasonable amount of time and thought. Being human, both parties are selfish. Many capitalists want more and more power, regardless of the rights of labor. Many laborers want more income and more ease, regardless of the rights and welfare of employers. As stated in the closing paragraph of the Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction, the urgent need of the time is for a new spirit in the hearts of both workers and capitalists. "Changes in our economic and political systems will have only partial and feeble efficacy if they be not reinforced by the Christian view of work and wealth."

3. A CATHOLIC SOCIAL PLATFORM

BY REV. JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S.J., PH.D.

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

The following "Platform" was officially adopted by various diocesan and national Catholic associations in English-speaking countries shortly after its appearance, towards the latter part of 1919. It was included by the author in his *Democratic Industry*, and was published separately, in different editions, at New York (1919) and at Oxford (1920). Thousands of copies were distributed by the Catholic Social Guild among pastors, M.P.'s, and prominent laymen.

It is a statement, in programmatic form, of the position of the Church on the great questions of Democracy and Industrial Relations, as gathered from the various official pronouncement of Popes and Bishops, and from the conclusions of recognized Catholic authorities.

To aid in the study and defense of the propositions contained in the platform, constant references are made in the footnotes to the various chapters of the author's two volumes in which the different clauses are further developed and their contentions established.¹

THE PLATFORM

PREAMBLE

1. True modern democracy first arose beneath the fostering care of the Church, derived its principles from the great Catholic thinkers of the Middle Ages, found its expression in many of the early Catholic city-democracies, was actively maintained

¹The American publishers of *A Catholic Social Platform*, and of the two volumes referred to throughout it are P. J. Kenedy & Sons (New York). Attention should also be called to Dr. Ryan's two books particularly bearing upon these subjects: *A Living Wage*, and *Distributive Justice*, published by The Macmillan Company.

in its rights of self-government during the wars of the twelfth century by Pope Alexander III, has been continuously exemplified since the thirteenth century in the Catholic cantons of Switzerland, and was most brilliantly defended in the theological schools of the seventeenth century. The Reformation doctrine of the Divine right of kings was ever strenuously opposed by the Church.²

2. All true democracy, as an embodiment of the brotherhood of man, must be based on the fundamental doctrine of the Fatherhood of God.³

3. Its aim is not the abolition of classes, from which universal happiness is vainly expected by some to flow. It freely acknowledges "the diversity of gifts that man receives, with the consequent inevitable difference in position, learning, acquirements and possessions which have ever characterized, and must always characterize the members of the human race." (Cardinal Bourne.)

4. The perfect social ideal is found only in the Christian cooperation of all classes and of all individuals, as members of one social body, under the governance of lawfully appointed authority, whose power, however conferred by the people, is ultimately derived from God.⁴

5. Democracy in education took its beginning in the great system of public schools created by the Church (Third and Fourth Lateran Councils, 1179 and 1215) and in the vast medieval universities fostered by her, with their gilds of masters and scholars.⁵

6. With the "Great Pillage," the suppression of monasteries and the confiscation of gild funds devoted to religion and charity, pauperism arose for the first time, as an extreme form of destitution, national in extent. The one power that by its very teaching and influence, as exemplified in the gilds at their perfection, could have preserved the working classes from the degradation to which they were subjected, was set aside. Hence the "rapacious usury" that followed, so that, as Pope Leo XIII

² *Democratic Industry*, Ch. XXVI.

³ *Ibid.*, Ch. V.

⁴ *The World Problem*, Ch. XXV.

⁵ *Democratic Industry*, Ch. XXIII.

described the conditions existing in his own day: "A small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the teeming masses of the laboring poor a yoke little better than slavery itself." ("On the Condition of the Working Classes," 1891.)⁶

7. The chief aim of Christian social endeavor, or "Christian Democracy," is, in the words of the same Pontiff: "To make the condition of those who toil more tolerable; to enable them to obtain, little by little, those means by which they may provide for the future; to help them to practise in public and in private the duties which morality and religion inculcate; to aid them to feel that they are not animals but men, not heathens but Christians, and so to enable them to strive more zealously and eagerly for the one thing which is necessary: the ultimate good for which we are all born into this world." ("On the Condition of the Working Classes.") *What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his own soul.* (Matt. xvi: 26.)⁷

I. FALSE SOCIAL SYSTEMS

8. Socialism is no solution for the evils which have followed the Reformation. Far from satisfying the legitimate desire of the worker for a personal share in productive ownership, it would ultimately deprive all alike of such ownership, subjecting the laborer hopelessly to a bureaucratic control, both tyrannical and inefficient. Socialism is more or less complete in proportion as it aims at this abolition of private productive ownership.⁸

9. Individualistic capitalism, understood as a system in which the means of production are in the hands of a few men of wealth, inspired merely with a passion for the utmost gain and unrestrained by due legal restrictions, is equally pernicious.⁹

⁶ *Ibid.*, Ch. XXVII.

⁷ *The World Problem*, Ch. XXV; *Democratic Industry*, Ch. XXVIII.

⁸ *The World Problem*, Ch. III; *Democratic Industry*, Ch. IV.

⁹ *The World Problem*, Chs. IV, XXI.

II. CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY

10. The Church of Christ has not been founded to teach any particular system of sociology or economics. She condemns whatever is morally false in the existing practices or theories and commends whatever form of social order, based upon the natural law and the Gospel, wisely answers the needs of any given period. She is not for any single generation, but for all time, while economic conditions are fluctuating perpetually.¹⁰

11. Yet it is the duty of Christians, particularly at the present moment, not to overlook the social dangers that imperil civilization; and it is possible for them to build up on her principles, teachings and traditions a true system of democratic industry which shall answer all the needs of their day. On no other foundation can a sound social order be erected.

12. Equally opposed to the unnatural abolition of private productive ownership under Socialism, and to its restriction to a few men of wealth under capitalism, the true social system advocates instead the widest diffusion of the possession of productive as well as of consumptive property, that as many as possible of the workers can hope, by just means, to become sharers in it. And this personally, and not merely in the name of a communistic commonwealth.¹¹

13. Such possession will satisfy the aspirations of men, lift them above the position of wage-earners only, and help to their full and harmonious development, insuring the stability of the new social order.¹²

14. Such was the consummation most closely attained when Catholic gildhood was in its prime and the influence of the Church effective; when the apprentice might hope, by industry, skill and virtue, to become a master; when each lived for all and all for each. Such is the Catholic ideal.¹³

¹⁰ *The World Problem*, XVII; *Democratic Industry*, V - VIII, etc.

¹¹ *The World Problem*, Ch. XVIII; *Democratic Industry*, Chs. I, XIX, etc.

¹² *Democratic Industry*, Chs. XXIX, XXX.

¹³ *Ibid.*, Chs. XVIII-XXII, XXV.

III. DEMOCRATIC INDUSTRY

15. The old organizations cannot be restored as they were. But it is possible, in the words of Pius X: "To adapt them to the new situation created by the material evolution of contemporary society in the same Christian spirit which of old inspired them."¹⁴

16. Such, in a material way, are the cooperative trade, credit and agricultural societies intended for self-help and to eliminate a wasteful system of distribution. Such are the attempts at cooperative production, where the entire enterprise is owned by the workers who alone receive both wage and profit, and where each worker is personal owner of shares and participates, directly or indirectly, in the management.¹⁵

17. Such, too, though less completely, are the various plans in which the workers own a considerable part of the voting stock. And such in fine, to a greater or less degree, are all copartnership arrangements by which the workers share in the corporate stock and reasonably participate in the industrial management: the regulation, through their shop guilds, of hours, wages, discipline, processes of production, etc.¹⁶

18. Since every business is constituted of money-capital and labor-capital, it is unreasonable that the former alone, as under capitalism, should have the entire power of control and the latter be subjected to a state of complete dependence. Men are more than money, and persons more precious than machinery.¹⁷

19. But for the lasting success of any economic plans, religion is essential. The guilds were able to maintain their spirit of democratic industry in proportion only to their religious

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, Ch. XXVIII.

¹⁵ *The World Problem*, Chs. XIX, XX; *Democratic Industry*, Chs. XXIX, XXX.

¹⁶ *The World Problem*, Ch. XIX; *Democratic Industry*, Ch. XVIII. American Bishops' *Social Reconstruction*. As early as 1914 the Irish Bishops wrote: "The difficulty of conducting successfully a commercial undertaking in the management of which the workers would have a voice, may, in most cases, be too much at present. But it looks as if the industrial world were at a stage of transition when such things are likely to be."—*The Labor Question*.

¹⁷ *Democratic Industry*, Ch. XVIII, etc.

zeal. With this they waxed or waned. Without certain disaster, religion can never be dissociated from economics.¹⁸

IV. THE PUBLIC GOOD

20. While keeping clearly in sight this vision of the true city, which is to be constructed after no merely speculative model, we must not forget the intermediate measures that are not, however, to be confounded with the ultimate goal.

21. Adequate government regulation should prevent the accumulation of excessive gains in the hands of a few, the monopolistic control of commodities, and the abuses that may arise in such public service monopolies as are under private operation.¹⁹

22. Monopolies or combines are guilty of injustice when in the articles of common use they exceed the highest prices that would obtain in the market were it freely open to competition, presuming in each instance the previous payment of a just wage. They may offend against charity by not lowering this price as well when notable hardship is inflicted upon the poor. All "cornering" must be prevented absolutely and all unfair business methods.²⁰

23. State ownership should not be introduced where State control suffices. The farther an industry is removed from a public service utility or a natural monopoly, the greater the presumption in favor of private ownership, cooperative or otherwise.²¹

24. Since it is the duty of the State to see that natural resources are turned to good account for the support and welfare of all the people, "the State or municipality should acquire, always for compensation, those agencies of production, and those agencies only, in which the public interest demands that public property rather than private ownership should exist." (Irish Bishops, 1914.)²²

25. Unjust restrictions should not be placed on those, who

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, Chs. XIV, XXVII.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, Ch. XII.

²⁰ *The World Problem*, Chs. V, VI.

²¹ *Ibid.*, Ch. XVIII.

²² *Ibid.*, Chs. III, XXI.

to the general benefit are acquiring legitimate prosperity under private enterprise.²³

26. Taxation should bear most upon those who are able to contribute most to the common good, but should not be made a means of confiscation. Special protection should be given to the small share-holder and a wider diffusion of shares made possible, within the limits of justice. The words of Pope Leo XIII must be borne in mind: "The right to possess private property is derived from nature, not from man; and the State has the right to control its use in the interest of the public good, but by no means to absorb it altogether. The State would therefore be unjust and cruel if under the name of taxation it were to deprive the private owner of more than is fitting." ("On the Condition of the Working Classes.")²⁴

V. LABOR MEASURES

27. Until a larger social justice reigns, minimum wage laws must enable every male worker to support a family in Christian decency. Every adult woman worker must be enabled to live respectably by her earnings alone. Enough should gradually be paid to make it possible for every worker to provide for the future out of his or her own wages, without need of State insurance. In this way only can industry be said to be properly supporting those engaged in it.²⁵

28. As exceptional business enterprise and efficiency, directed towards the greater common good, is entitled to an exceptional reward, so labor also should be remunerated in proportion to its contribution to industry.

29. By workers we understand all engaged in mental as well as in manual occupations, in the service of distribution or production, from manager to messenger, although the need of State protection for the former may be insignificant.

30. As the State must come to the aid of the consumer in as far as the general welfare requires, so too it must safeguard

²³ *Ibid.*, Ch. XVIII.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, Ch. XXI.

²⁵ *The World Problem*, Ch. IX.

labor's rights: religious, moral, physical and economic. In like manner the rights of every class must be duly protected by it to whatever extent the common good demands.²⁶

31. The duty of labor is to give a fair day's work, as the duty of the employer is to provide a fair wage and proper working conditions, from a religious and moral, as well as from a material and sanitary point of view. Wages as well as profits should be kept within the limits of the public good.²⁷

32. Strikes are permitted for a grave and just cause, when there is hope of success and no other satisfactory solution can be found, when justice and charity are preserved, and the rights of the public duly respected. Yet conciliation, arbitration and trade agreements are the natural means to be suggested in their stead. Hence the utility of public boards for this purpose. As in the strike, so in the lock-out, a serious and just cause is required, and the rights of the workers and of the public must be respected. Charity is far more readily violated in the lock-out than in the strike, because of the greater suffering likely to be inflicted on the laborer deprived of his work than on the employer.²⁸

33. Justification of the sympathetic strike will rarely be found, while the presumption is overwhelmingly against the general sympathetic strike.²⁹ Blacklists on the part of employers that permanently exclude from his trade a worker displeasing to them, who honestly seeks employment, are opposed to the first principles of justice.

34. The problem of unemployment should be met by a permanent national employment service, acting with the co-operation of municipal and private bureaus. Methods of preventing or meeting the crises of unemployment should be carefully studied. Governments have a serious duty to obviate this evil, and provide for the unemployed according to their necessity.³⁰

35. Hours of labor should be neither unreasonably long nor unreasonably short. Sunday labor should be prohibited, ex-

²⁶ *Ibid.*, Ch. VIII.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, Ch. X.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, Ch. XI.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, Ch. XII.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, Chs. XIII, XIV.

cept in cases of real necessity, such as is too often merely presumed to exist.³¹

36. Until labor can properly provide for itself, the State should interest itself in housing conditions, particularly where there is danger to morals and religion as well as to the physical well-being of the worker and of his family. Health inspection in the school and municipal clinics for the poor are recommended.³²

37. Vocational training is desirable, without neglecting the cultural and religious education of our children. "A healthy democracy cannot tolerate a purely industrial or trade education for any class of its citizens." Further, "the opportunities of the system should be extended to all qualified private schools on exactly the same basis as to the public schools. We want neither class divisions in education nor a State monopoly of education." (American Bishops' "Social Reconstruction.")³³

38. So long as proper wages are not accorded, social insurance is to be favored to whatever extent may be necessary to safeguard the laborer in sickness, accident, invalidity and old age. It must be clearly understood, however, that there is question of a temporary substitute only for an adequate wage, which will enable the worker to carry his own insurance and not to be a mere ward of the State. The dignity of labor must be protected from communistic paternalism as well as from capitalistic abuses.³⁴

39. An intelligent penal system will make it possible for dependents to live upon the earnings of the imprisoned wage-earner. It may also enable the prisoner to lay aside something for future rehabilitation.³⁵

40. The right of labor organization is no longer in question and never should have been. The worker should see that Christian principles are maintained within his union and not permit it, through his own carelessness, to be made the helpless tool of extremists.³⁶

³¹ *Ibid.*, Ch. VIII; *Democratic Industry*, Chs. XIX, XX.

³² *The World Problem*, Ch. II.

³³ *Democratic Industry*, Ch. XXI.

³⁴ *The World Problem*, Ch. XVII; *Democratic Industry*, Ch. IV.

³⁵ *The World Problem*, Ch. XVII.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, Ch. XVI; *Democratic Industry*, Ch. III.

41. It is therefore of the highest importance that Christian social education through organization and literature, be extended to every single one of our own labor unionists. Hence also the imperative need of Christian schools of sociology for the training of Christian social leaders.³⁷

VI. WOMAN LABOR

42. Exploitation of woman and child labor is to be strictly abolished, as well as every other form of sweating.³⁸

43. While woman in industry is to receive a minimum wage sufficient for her own support, it is reasonable that she should moreover be paid according to her service. This will imply an equal wage with man for work equal in quantity and quality, when engaged at the same task with him.³⁹

44. If wife and mother are no longer driven to the factory, owing to the husband's inadequate wage, and child labor is ended, there will be work for the fathers of families as well as for all men and women who must provide their own support. So too a widowed mother's pension, to be paid as far as necessary, will keep both mother and children in the home.⁴⁰

45. "Woman," says Leo XIII, "is by nature fitted for home-work, and it is this which is best adapted to her modesty and to promote the good up-bringing of children and the well-being of the family." ("On the Condition of the Working Classes.") "The proportion of women in industry ought to be kept within the smallest practical limits." (American Bishops' "Social Reconstruction.") They should not be placed at occupations unfit, or morally and physically dangerous; it is the duty of the State to ensure this right for them and to secure for them reasonable hours, sanitary conditions, abolition of night work, and the removal of all circumstances injurious to sex and maternity.⁴¹

³⁷ *The World Problem*, Chs. XVI, XXV.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, Chs. XXII, XXIII, XXIV.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, Ch. XXIII.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, Ch. XVII.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, Ch. XXIV.

VII. FARM LABOR

46. Every just encouragement is to be given to promote farm labor and the development of a large class of small farm owners.⁴²

47. Cooperative buying, selling and credit associations, and cooperative production are here to be particularly recommended as thoroughly approved by experience. All abuses in transportation, working equal hardship on the producer and consumer, must be removed, and produce brought to the market with the least intervention of middlemen.⁴³

48. Government loans should be made, where needed, to enable men to settle upon the land, either as owners or as tenants with long-time leases. "It is essential that both the work of preparation and the subsequent settlement of the land should be effected by groups or colonies, not by men living independently of one another and in depressing isolation." (American Bishops' "Social Reconstruction.") Attention should be given in particular to the facilities of regularly fulfilling religious duties. The problem of the farm laborer, too, is to be carefully studied.⁴⁴

49. The principle of land nationalization is to be strongly condemned as unnatural, economically ruinous and undemocratic. The rights of the tiller to his soil must be held sacred. Keeping inviolate all just property rights, the laborer should "be encouraged to look forward to obtaining a share in the land." (Leo XIII, "On the Condition of the Working Classes.")⁴⁵

VIII. CAUSES OF SOCIAL DISASTER

50. The roots of the social problem penetrate deep. The evils of impurity, birth control and divorce corrupt the individual, the home and society. With these are associated the in-

⁴² *Ibid.*, Ch. XV; *Democratic Industry*, Ch. VIII.

⁴³ *The World Problem*, Chs. XIX, XX, VII; *Democratic Industry*, Ch. XIII.

⁴⁴ *The World Problem*, Ch. XV.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, Ch. XVIII.

ordinate craving after pleasure, the shirking of duty, and the wide-spread wastefulness and excess of all classes, together with a desire for the utmost gain, regardless of the common good.⁴⁶

51. These evils, which naturally flow from a rejection of religion, are most intimately connected with all our economic and social disorders, whose last cause is godlessness.⁴⁷

52. Finally, there is the doctrine that would make of the State a fetish to which all human rights, whether of the family or of the individual, are to be relentlessly sacrificed. Hence follow State autocracy, bureaucracy, Socialism and all the endless forms of State paternalism that threaten to submerge democracy.⁴⁸

IX. FIRST PRINCIPLES

53. The sacredness of all human life must be recognized, and the duty of conforming it to the Will of God.

54. The purity of family life must be restored, and the family, as the unit of society, must bravely assume its duties and responsibilities in a true Christian spirit. The future belongs to those who safeguard the home.

55. The pagan theory that the individual exists for the State and not the State for the individual, must be absolutely rejected.

56. Secularization of education must be opposed as the greatest danger to modern society, together with all over-centralization and undue State interference, as tending to establish the most pernicious of all autocracies. To the parent alone, and not to the State, belongs, of itself and directly, the responsibility for the upbringing of the child.

57. The safeguarding of the just rights of Christianity, on which the future of civilization depends, is not possible without the development of a strong, alert, loyal and intelligent Christian press. The support and furtherance of this is a first duty. The law, on the other hand, should be made to prevent

⁴⁶ *The World Problem*, Chs. II, XI; *Democratic Industry*, Ch. IX.

⁴⁷ *The World Problem*, Ch. XIV. See in particular the present author's volume: *Evolution and Social Progress*.

⁴⁸ *Democratic Industry*, Chs. I, IV, XXVI, XXIX, etc.

the publication of untrue statements and reports, and protect from slander all, whether individually or collectively.

58. The success of Christian Democracy, which is purely social and not political, will finally depend upon the utmost organization and concentration of effort. Nor should Catholics neglect the full use of their political rights in the measure in which they are granted to every citizen, since by reason of their Divine Faith they "may prove themselves capable, as much as, and even more than others, of cooperating in the material and civil well-being of the people, thus acquiring that authority and respect which may make it even possible for them to defend and promote a higher good, namely, that of the soul." (Pius X, "Christian Social Action.")

CONCLUSION

59. Besides the rules of social justice, the laws of Christian charity should bind together employer and employees, and all classes and ranks, into one Christian brotherhood. To accomplish this in its perfection, nothing can be of greater importance than that all should heed again the voice of that Mother from whom the nations have wandered, who begot them in the unity of a great Christendom in the ages of Catholic Faith. Her teachings are the same now as they were in the days of the Apostles, and as they will remain to the end of time, yet always perfectly adapted to every changing period of history. For the promise of Christ to her can never be made void: "Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." (Matt. xxviii: 20.)⁴⁹

60. Hence she alone can never possibly mislead mankind, and there can be no surer hope for true and lasting reconstruction than the return of all to her, the one and only apostolic Church, the Church of our fathers.

⁴⁹ *The World Problem*, Ch. XXV.

BRIEF LIST OF BOOKS BY CATHOLIC AUTHORS ON ECONOMIC QUESTIONS

- The Social Value of the Gospel; by L. Garriguet. Herder.
 The Pope and the People; Catholic Truth Society. (This book contains the encyclicals of Pope Leo on Labor, etc.)
 A Living Wage; by John A. Ryan, D.D. Macmillan, 1920.
 Distributive Justice; by John A. Ryan, D.D. Macmillan.
 Social Reconstruction; by John A. Ryan, D.D. Macmillan.
 The World Problem: Capital, Labor, and the Church; by Joseph Husslein, S.J., Ph.D. Kenedy.
 Democratic Industry; by Joseph Husslein, S.J., Ph.D. Kenedy.
 Evolution and Social Progress; by Joseph Husslein, S.J., Ph.D. Kenedy.
 Elements of Social and Political Economy; by Dardano. Translated by Rev. W. McLaughlin. Gill, Dublin.
 Primer of Social Science; by Msgr. Parkinson. Devin-Adair Co.
 Private Ownership; by Rev. J. Kelleher. Gill, Dublin.
 Introduction to Economics; by Frank O'Hara. Macmillan.
 Political Economy; by C. S. Devas. Longmans & Co.
 Primer of Political Economy in Catechism Form; by Rev. Dr. Joseph Och.
 Mediæval Socialism; by Bede Jarret, O.P. People's Books.
 St. Antonino and Mediæval Economics; by Bede Jarret, O.P. Herder, St. Louis.
 Consumers and Wage Earners; by J. Elliot Ross. Devin-Adair Co.
 The Theistic Ideal and the Distributive State; by Rev. Patrick Casey. Diedrich-Schaefer, Milwaukee.
 The Church and Socialism; by John A. Ryan, D.D. University Press, Washington.
 Catholic Ideals in Social Life; by Fr. Cuthbert, O.S.F.C. Art & Book Co.
 Alleged Socialism of the Church Fathers; by John A. Ryan, D.D. Herder, St. Louis.
 Socialism; by V. Cathrein, S.J. Benziger Bros.
 Socialism: Promise or Menace?; by Hilquit-Ryan. Macmillan.
 The Fundamental Fallacy of Socialism; by Arthur Preuss. Herder, St. Louis.
 The Articles in the Catholic Encyclopedia on Property, Collectivism, Communism, Socialism, Syndicalism, Monopoly, Interest, Usury, Speculation, Compensation, Labor Unions, and Boycott.
 Cours d'Economie Sociale; by Rev. C. Antoine, S.J. Paris.

Lehrbuch der Nationaloekonomie; by Rev. H. Pesch, S.J. Leipzig.
 Regime de la Propriété; by L. Garriguet. Bloud, Paris.
 Regime du Travail; by L. Garriguet. Bloud, Paris.
 Die Soziale Frage; by Joseph Biederlack, S.J. Herder.

PAMPHLETS

The Condition of Labor; by Pope Leo XIII. International Catholic Truth Society, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 General Principles of Social Reform; by Dr. C. Bruehl. The Catholic Truth Society.
 The Catholic Doctrine of Property; by Rev. J. B. McLaughlin, O.S.B. The Catholic Truth Society, London.
 The Social Action Series. The Catholic Truth Society.
 English Economists and Catholic Ethics by Rev. M. Maher. The Catholic Truth Society and The Catholic Mind, America Press.
 Social Reform by Legislation; by John A. Ryan, D.D. The Paulist Press, New York City.
 Pamphlets of the English Catholic Social Guild. Herder, St. Louis.
 Pamphlets of the National Catholic War Council and especially, "Social Reconstruction," Washington, D. C.
 Pamphlets of the National Catholic Welfare Council, Washington, D. C.

EVOLUTION AND SOCIAL PROGRESS

By JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S.J., PH.D.

P. J. KENEDY & SONS

44 BARCLAY STREET

New York City, N. Y.

THE END



LIB. ACCN.

HD 6338 .R8 C.1
The church and labor,
Stanford University Libraries



3 6105 036 230 113

HD
6338
.R8

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
CECIL H. GREEN LIBRARY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305-6004
(415) 723-1493

All books may be recalled after 7 days

DATE DUE

JUN 2 96 2000
JUN 2 96 2000

